FBIS DAILY REPORT

# CONTENTS

*Soviet Union*

*Vol III No 150* *4 August 1982*

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/START/MBFR

Senators Demand Arms Treaties Ratification AA 1
[PRAVDA 4 Aug]
General Kozlov Describes U.S. Space Use Plans AA 1
[Prague MLADA FRONTA 30 Jul]
USSR, U.S. START Talks Plenum Meets 3 August AA 2
Disarmament Committee Session Held in Geneva AA 3
Zholkver Comments on Peace March, U.S. Policies AA 3
Reportage on Peace March-82 Activities AA 4
Soviet Peace Group Discussion AA 4
Minsk Rally AA 7
[Simurov, Yanovskiy in PRAVDA 30 Jul]
Text of 'Joint Statement' [PRAVDA 31 Jul] AA 8
Events in Kiev [PRAVDA 2 Aug] AA 9
IUS Message AA 9
Rally in CSSR [Mikhalchenko] AA 9

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Bolshakov in PRAVDA 'International Review' [1 Aug] CC 1
Zagladin Interviewed on Current World Events [Prague] CC 4
Anniversary of Helsinki Conference Noted CC 11
PRAVDA Editorial [1 Aug] CC 11
Zhukov Article [PRAVDA 30 Jul] CC 13
CSCE Principles Remain Valid CC 16
[Kovalev in SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 1 Aug]
Deputy Ministers on Pipeline Construction CC 17
CEMA 'Production-Sharing' CC 17
[Sofia OTECHESTVEN FRONT]
'Strictly on Schedule' CC 17
[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA]
U.S., EEC 'Steel War' Negotiations Viewed [Bogatov] CC 18
'Obsolete' U.S. View of Ties With West Europe [Aleksandrov] CC 19

UNITED STATES & CANADA

PRAVDA Reports on Reagan Press Conference, Poll A 1
[30 Jul]
U.S. Arms Sales Abroad Implement Foreign Policy A 1
Military Exports A 1
'Conventional Weapons' Report A 2
Further on Report [Mnatsakanov] A 2
Contrast With USSR Policy [Ablamov] A 2
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Evaluates U.S. 'Stealth' Ability A 4
[Alekseyev, 28 Jul]
U.S. To Expand VOA 'Psychological War' on USSR A 6

CHINA

Arabic Service on PRC Cooperation With Israel B 1

SOUTH ASIA

Brezhnev, Maldives President Exchange Telegrams D 1
Pakistani Policies Seen Disrupting World Peace D 1
Press Photo Shows USSR Troops in Afghanistan D 2
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 10 Jul]

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

Sihanouk's Coalition Part of PRC Strategy E 1
[Ganshin in IZVESTIYA 28 Jul]
IZVESTIYA Reports on Kampuchea's Recovery E 2
[Vinogradov, 21 Jul]

EASTERN EUROPE

IZVESTIYA Interviews Bulgarian Foreign Minister [3 Aug] F 1
U.S. View of 'Improvements' in Poland Noted [Pozner] F 1
Polish Media Cited on Anti-Polish Activities F 2
[PRAVDA 30 Jul]
Moscow Leaders Greet Polish Counterparts F 2
[MOSCOVSKAYA PRAVDA 22 Jul]
PRAVDA: LCY Plenum Views Socioeconomic Problems F 3
[Sharov, 30 Jul]

WESTERN EUROPE

IZVESTIYA: W. Europe Becoming U.S. 'Servitor' [3 Aug] G 1
Lipovoy: Greeks Angry at U.S. Subversion Plans G 1
[IZVESTIYA 28 Jul]

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

PRAVDA Editorial Article on Lebanon 4 August H 1
Brezhnev Message, USSR Mideast Policy Viewed H 4
Comparison H 5
Arab Media Cited H 5
Gerasimov Discounts Reagan Remarks on Lebanon H 6
Shamir Concludes Official Visit to U.S. H 6
Joint Statement Derided H 7
NOVOYE VREMYA Editorial on Lebanese Settlement [No 31] H 7
RPP Defense of Soviet Arms, Aid to Arabs H 8
U.S., Israel Attempt To 'Torpedo' UN Efforts H 9
IZVESTIYA Attacks Habib Mideast Missions H 11
[Geyvandov, 2 Aug]
U.S. Dispatching 'Mercenaries' to Israel [Ponomarev] H 12
U.S., Israel Share Responsibility for Lebanon H 13
Romberg Statement [Mnatsakanov] H 13
Identity of Views [Mnatsakanov] H 14
'Common Aims' [Shabayev] H 14

Nicaraguan, Cuban Ministers Arrive in Moscow H 15
Attempts To Rally Support for Palestinians H 16
Saudi, PDRY, YAR Leaders H 16
Castro Urges UN Action [PRAVDA 30 Jul] H 16
PFLP's Habash on Palestinians' 'Steadfastness' H 16
Meetings Protest Israeli 'Brazen Aggression' H 17
Further Report H 18
Egyptian Minister Cited on Regional Issues H 18
Soviet-Algerian Economic Talks Begin in Moscow H 18

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Moscow Television on Attempted Coup in Kenya [Dunayev] J 1
Tanzanian Agency on U.S. 'Anti-African Operation' J 1

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Bishop Comments on USSR-Grenada Agreements K 1
Sandinist Leaders Thank Brezhnev, Tikhonov [PRAVDA 31 Jul] K 1
RPP Charges of Nuclear Weapons on Sheffield [Vladimirov] K 1
U.S. 'Military Preparations' in Caribbean Scored [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 Aug] K 2
RPP Scores U.S. Intervention in Central America K 3

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

Agricultural Developments for 3 Aug Reported T 1
Agricultural Official on Harvest Progress T 1
IZVESTIYA: Fertilizer Production Delayed [23 Jul] T 2
RSFSR CSA Reports Grain Harvest Progress T 4
Statistics Analyzed T 4

SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS

Cosmos-1398 Earth Satellite Launched 3 Aug U 1
Late Report: Cosmos-1399 Satellite Launched U 1
Briefs: Uzbek Medical Center; Tashkent Scientific Meeting U 1

MILITARY DEVELOPMENTS

Admiral Medvedev Writes in IZVESTIYA on Navy Day [25 Jul] V 1

SENATORS DEMAND ARMS TREATIES RATIFICATION

LD040554 Moscow TASS in English 0540 GMT 4 Aug 82

["Newspaper PRAVDA: There Is No Justification" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow August 4 TASS -- PRAVDA under the headline "There Is No Justification" comments on a resolution tabled in the upper house of the U.S. Congress by a group of senators recently. In the resolution the group demanded that President Ronald Reagan ratify as soon as possible the 1974 treaty between the USSR and the USA on limiting underground tests of nuclear weapons and the 1976 treaty on underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes.

The senators also demanded that the head of the White House reconsider his decision against resuming negotiations with the USSR and Britain on total ban of nuclear weapons tests.

The treaty banning the tests of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water is known to have been concluded in 1963, PRAVDA recalls. Later on the USSR and the USA signed treaties on limiting underground tests of nuclear weapons to explosive devices of not more than 150 kilotons (1974) and on underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes (1976). The world public hoped that following those treaties an all-embracing treaty would be elaborated and enter into force. However, in 1980 the previous administration of the USA broke off further negotiations. And now comes a final refusal to negotiate.

"In an attempt to somehow justify themselves and to put a good face on the matter in an obviously poor political game," the commentary says, "spokesmen of the Washington administration are now stating some "irreconcilable differences" with the Soviet Union, first of all concerning ways for the verification and observation of nuclear explosions. Various insinuations are being resorted to to the effect that the USSR allegedly violates the already achieved accords. However, all that is the purest invention.

"The White House slammed the door for quite different reasons. As the press reports, at a meeting of the Naitonal Security Council the president took this decision at the bidding of the Pentagon officers who warned that termination of tests would deal a blow at the further development and modernisation of U.S. nuclear arsenals. It is known what a huge programme for so-called nuclear rearmament the Reagan administration has adopted."

"It is not fortuitous, of course," PRAVDA writes in conclusion, "that the White House's refusal to negotiate a ban on nuclear weapons tests coincided with the President's decision to almost double the arsenal of the neutron warheads of the USA."

GENERAL KOZLOV DESCRIBES U.S. SPACE USE PLANS

AUQ32002 Prague MLADA FRONTA in Czech 30 Jul 82 p 5

[Article by Maj Gen Svyatoslav Kozlov "written for MLADA FRONTA via the APN": "Pentagon Is Arming Itself in Space"]

[Text] With the fourth and last test flight of the American spaceship Columbia the green light has been given to the Space Shuttle Program. This program has been developed thus far by a civilian agency for space research (NASA), for what was formally called "peaceful purposes." But in reality the special attraction of space for military uses basically corresponded to the Pentagon's needs. NASA's participation served merely to cover up the real aims and the use of large budget outlays, since this "made things easier" for the Pentagon's budget. Now the mask has been discarded and the Pentagon has openly taken every kind of space activity under its wing in the interests of extending militarism.

For this purpose, a special Space Command has been set up in the U.S. Air Force, which is attached to the existing five regional and three special commands intended to operationally manage the preparation and use of the individual services of U.S. Armed Forces in war in harmony with the Pentagon's global military policy and doctrine.

The creation of a new operational Space Command shows that the means of conducting a war in space have left the stage of proposals and research and have become part of the system of other military pursuits. The command's task is to independently coordinate and direct every military activity in space on a global scale.

According to the Pentagon's appraisal, its special significance lies in the fact that utilization of the main U.S. strike force has become unthinkable without the use of the space systems of direction, intelligence, communications, targeting and navigation. Its establishment reveals the fact that the Pentagon is staking everything on creating new kinds of weapons intended to destroy and neutralize the artificial satellites and all space systems and to achieve and maintain supremacy in space. In the Pentagon's opinion, this supremacy would provide it an opportunity to deliver an unexpected strike against ground targets.

"The country that ensures for itself military supremacy in space can dictate its own conditions," J. Graham, general of the reserve and former chief of intelligence in the U.S. Department of Defense, one of the protagonists of the new sphere of war, declared.

The realization of these and similar ominous ideas of the American militarists has been literally timed to coincide with the second special UN General Assembly session on disarmament. Despite the persistent efforts of peace-loving people in the world community who are striving to diminish the danger of war, the United States is demonstrating a supercilious indifference toward mankind's will and opening up new paths in the arms race while not leaving even space in peace.

The realization of this danger long ago led the peace-loving peoples to undertake serious steps to prevent the militarization of space, which is filled with new dangers. On the USSR's initiative, a number of international agreements have been concluded aimed at achieving the above-mentioned goal. Most of them also bear the U.S. signature: the treaty of 1953, banning nuclear tests in the three environments, including space; the convention of 1977, banning the dispatching of mass destruction weapons into space; the SALT I and SALT II treaties and other treaties and agreements limitating and banning the military utilization of space.

In the years 1978 and 1979 the USSR and the United States were engaged in talks on anti-satellite systems. Washington has unilaterally broken off these talks.

In 1981, the USSR submitted to the United Nations a draft international treaty banning the deployment of all arms in space. This initiative was supported by 123 states. The Geneva Disarmament Committee has been charged by the United Nations with the task of working out an appropriate agreement.

The United States is ignoring the will of the international public and is taking newer and newer thoughtless steps on the path of a dubious competition in the race for the improbable fiction of achieving military supremacy on our planet.

USSR, U.S. START TALKS PLENUM MEETS 3 AUGUST

LD031212 Moscow TASS in English 1110 GMT 3 Aug 82

[Text] Geneva August 3 TASS -- A plenary session of the delegations of the USSR and the USA at the negotiations on limiting and reducing strategic arms took place here today.

DISARMAMENT COMMITTEE SESSION HELD IN GENEVA

LD031208 Moscow TASS in English 1148 GMT 3 Aug 82

[Text] Geneva August 3 TASS -- A plenary meeting of the Disarmament Committee was held here today. Among items on its agenda are ending of the nuclear arms race and attaining of nuclear disarmament, complete and general ban on nuclear tests, banning and destruction of chemical weapons, prevention of the arms race in space.

The committee paid close attention to the draft convention on banning chemical weapons and the draft treaty on banning the emplacement in space of weapons of any types, the drafts tabled by the Soviet Union. Speaking at the meeting, USSR representative Viktor Israelyan stressed that the Soviet delegation is determined to conduct concrete business negotiations on the entire range of the agenda and said that the USSR submitted to the committee the proposals aimed at the earliest attainment of mutually acceptable agreements.

Representatives of India, Mexico, Brazil and a number of other states also addressed the meeting.

ZHOLKVER COMMENTS ON PEACE MARCH, U.S. POLICIES

LD041020 Moscow World Service in English 1300 GMT 3 Aug 82

[Text] Mass antiwar action is now going in many countries. An international conference for banning nuclear weapons has begun in Tokyo; and in the Soviet Union the 1982 peace marchers have covered the last leg of their march. Taking part are men and women from 30 countries of Europe, America, Asia and Africa. Here is what Radio Moscow commentator Aleksandr Zholkver writes:

In the different cities of the Soviet Union the Peace March was joined by thousands of people. One of the participants (Torveld Ede), representing one of Norway's Christian organizations, said that her biggest impression was that the word 'peace' in the Soviet Union is pronounced with joy by everyone. But is there really a country where the word 'peace' isn't pronounced with joy?

Of course, as our listeners remember, only recently the State Department in Washington was headed by a person who asserted in public that there are more important things than peace. Now another man is in charge of the department, but has there been any change in Washington's policy? What are some of the latest foreign policy actions of the United States? There is continuing active support of Israel's barbaric actions and of the destruction of the peaceful population in Lebanon. There is also support for the pro-American government in El Salvador, which is annihilating its own people. America supplies arms to Pakistan, whose territory is used for staging hostile acts against neighboring countries. The United States continues to hold onto its old military bases and build new ones, and that on the vast area from the islands in the Atlantic and the Pacific to the launching pads in Western Europe.

As for U.S. diplomats, they are advancing clearly unacceptable demands at the talks on limiting arms, and have decided to curtail in general talks on ending nuclear tests. U.S. diplomats are very active when it comes to working out various sanctions against economic contacts among countries, and extremely passive when discussing measures of strengthening universal peace, including the pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, a pledge the Soviet Union has already made. At the same time the Pentagon is carrying out an unprecedented in peacetime program of building up the strategic potential of the United States, from nuclear missiles and neutron shells to new bombers and chemical weapons.

President Reagan comes out against his own congressmen when they try to reduce even slightly the truly astronomic military appropriations or, what's more, dare to speak out for freezing nuclear arsenals. However that doesn't seem to prevent President Reagan from stating from time to time that he, too, is allegedly for peace. But who can really believe that?

In any case it is hard to suppose that the 1982 peace marchers will believe that. From city to city, from country to country, they continue to carry placards reading "No to nuclear weapons all over the world" and "Yes to disarmament and peace."

REPORTAGE ON PEACE MARCH-82 ACTIVITIES

Soviet Peace Group Discussion

LD032238 Moscow in Finnish to Finland 1530 GMT 26 Jul 82

[Text] Peace March-82 continues in the Soviet Union. Today the participants arrived in the old town of Smolensk. Before that the Danes, Norwegians, Swedes and Finns on the march spent 5 days in Moscow during which they visited several industrial establishments and took part in peace gatherings. One of these was organized as a roundtable discussion at the Soviet Peace Committee. The committee chairman, Georgiy Zhukov, said that the Soviet Peace Committee is an independent extra-governmental organization. It takes an active part in the international movement of the defenders of peace. The committee has its own branches at industrial establishments and at offices. It is these that helped in the organization of the Peace March on Soviet territory.

Describing the committee's recent activities, Georgiy Zhukov said that before the second special session of the UN General Assembly on disarmament, the committee organized 20,000 marches, demonstrations and other events all over the country. At these events 60 million participants demanded disarmament and a ban on nuclear weapons. The Soviet peace movement works under the same slogans that are now being carried by the participants of the Peace March. No to nuclear weapons in Europe, in the West and the East; No to nuclear weapons in the whole world; Yes to disarmament and the strengthening of peace. Under similar slogans 60 million Soviet people took part in several peace rallies last May, before the UN special session.

Georgiy Zhukov said: The Soviet people follow the progress of the Peace March with interest. A few days ago the peace committee received the following two letters: A s scientist and war veteran, (Zhigunov), working at a Moscow research establishment, writes: Let me, via the Peace Committee, turn to all the participants in Peace March-82 and in their name to all the people in the world. I am convinced that all Soviet people agree with me. Continue to strengthen peace in the world, men, comrades, friends. There is no task more important than the safeguarding of peace. We must not burn up in a nuclear war. We must protect ourselves and the whole world. The second letter has come from the village of (Striganka) in the (Melnichki) area of the Ukraine. It has been written by a kolkhoz worker, (Galiuk). I am a Christian and a believer. But even so I agree with Communists and people representing other convictions, with all those who defend peace.

The Soviet Peace Committee has received hundreds of letters like this during the Peace March, Georgiy Zhukov emphasizes.

The discussion began after the opening speech. The Nordic peace champions asked questions to which the members of the Peace Committee replied. The first question was put by (Paula Odenius): I represent two peace organizations in Sweden. Statesmen (?decide) on armaments or disarmament, but military preparations and nuclear armaments require money, a lot of money and effort. For this reason we are against all those who continue the nuclear arms race.

Georgiy Zhukov said that national movements, especially taking into account the first year of World War II, have given many examples of their strength. In the 1950's signatures were collected for the famous Stockholm appeal against the nuclear bomb. It was signed by 500 million people in the world, including 140 million Soviet citizens. What was the outcome of the Stockholm appeal? General MacArthur, who intended to use the atom bomb in Korea, had to resign from his post and the war on the Korean peninsula came to an end. And another example: In 1976 another appeal emerged from Stockholm. It demanded a ban on all kinds of new nuclear weapons. It has been signed by 800 million people so far. And do you remember the results of the peoples' demonstrations against the American war in Vietnam?

Thus the peace movements have their possibilities, but it is also true that, despite our strength, the arms spiral continues. As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, we have, as you know, suspended the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe. Even more, we have begun a considerable reduction in their numbers. But the United States is feverishly preparing to deploy medium-range missiles in Europe. What conclusion have we drawn from this? We must strengthen even further the struggle against nuclear weapons in Europe. I am convinced that the result will be positive. We must increase ten-fold our activities for a ban on nuclear weapons.

Concerning the danger threatening the United States, Leonid Brezhnev said at the 26th CPSU Congress: The United States as well as other countries is threatened by a military danger, but it is caused not by the Soviet Union or its mythical superiority but by the armaments which maintain a tense situation in the world. We are ready to fight side by side with the United States, the states of Europe and all the countries on our planet against such a real, and not an imaginary, danger. The attempts to surpass each other in armaments and the striving for victory in a nuclear war is dangerous; it is senselessness.

The congress received these words of Brezhnev's with enthusiasm, Georgiy Zhukov noted. This was said a year ago. Unfortunately the meeting with Reagan, proposed by Brezhnev at that time, has not yet taken place. We must work increasingly energetically against armaments and for talks on the total elimination of nuclear weapons, Georgiy Zhukov stressed.

The chairman of the Soviet Peace Committee, Georgiy Zhukov, said further that the Soviet peace defenders cooperate with all peace defenders in the world, including those in the United States, although here there are certain difficulties. Initially when United States peace defenders invited a Soviet peace delegation to come to the United States in connection with the second special disarmament session, we were first denied entry visas. But later, when demands arose in the United States that visas be given to us, we obtained them, although on every passport was attached the note: You may be present in the session halls of the General Assembly but if you try to take part in gatherings outside the UN premises you will be expelled from the country immediately.

I am sure you know that during those days a peace rally was held in New York. A million people took part. Comrade Ponomarev and some other comrades, members of the Peace Committee, were not able to participate. For this reason a message of greetings to the U.S. peace defenders was sent to the rally on behalf of the delegation. At the demonstration it was asked why the delegation was not present. The chairman of the rally announced that the delegation was in the UN building, but that the members had been banned from taking part in the event. The announcement precipitated protests, and a telegram was sent to the State Department. Despite everything, we are pleased that our message reached the million participants in the demonstration. We also handed a letter, signed by 14,000 people, to the UN secretary general.

We are prepared to take part in all kinds of joint activities with peace defenders in all countries, Georgiy Zhukov said. We would be happy to organize Peace March-83 in the West in order that the people there can hear about our striving for friendship.

(Valborg Hansson) from Sweden said: According to what we have heard here, we have reached the conclusion that in the Soviet Union energetic efforts are being made for peace, but in Sweden and other countries there is hardly any knowledge of this work. Ways should be sought to disseminate information. Perhaps we should publish material we have received from you in the periodical of our peace defenders.

The question put by (Valborg Hansson) was aswered by Professor Zhurkin, who is deputy director of the United States of American and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Science. The basic task of the Soviet Peace Committee is to prevent nuclear war. For this reason the slogans of Peace March-82 are close to the hearts of the Soviet poeple. The problem is complicated, and therefore the Soviet peace defenders take part in drafting proposals for banning all kinds of weapons gradually, for lowering the level of nuclear armaments, and so on. He demanded the destruction of chemical, bacteriological and other mass destruction weapons. The Soviet Peace Committe has several times demanded that the level of the armaments of the big countries, or NATO and the Warsaw Treaty, be frozen in order to facilitate a beginning of their reduction.

We are also drafting proposals for the formation of a nuclear weapons-free zone in northern Europe and the whole continent. We receive many letters on these questions, we publisn them and bring them to the attention of the government.

(Eila Tapanainen) from Finland said: In the Nordic countries, especially in the Women for Peace Movement, the importance of grassroots level activities has been stressed. This means activity in small groups and on the level of individuals in everyone's working and living environment. I myself belong to the peace group of my home town, Kirkkonummi. We are only about 10 to 20 people, and we began our activities in the study circle of the adult education establishment. I would like to know whether there are corresponding groups in the Soviet Union and whether it would be possible for us to establish contacts with such groups if they exist in the Soviet Union.

Professor Zhurkin replied to this, saying that naturally it is possible to correspond with the Soviet Peace Committee, and for this purpose it is only necessary to leave one's home address. The basic organizations of the Peach Committee will be glad to exchange views on their peace activities with foreigners. The Soviet Peace Committee has 10,000 basic organizations in factories, schools and offices.

(Oeivind Taddo) from Norway asked the following question: We have discussed disarmament. In this question the most important attitudes are held by the Soviet Union and the United States. Therefore I would like to ask whether the Peace Committee can influence the Soviet Government in the field of disarmament.

The chairman of the Peace Committee, Georgiy Zhukov, said that the relations between the organization and the Soviet Government are the same as corresponding relations between peace organizations and governments in other countries. The Peace Committee is a civic organization, operating on the basis of money obtained from the Peace Fund. It consists of donations, which so far have come from 80 million Soviet people. The organization is extra governmental and fully independent, but it has considerable funds.

We are sometimes asked: Why do you not demonstrate against the government? Why do you not fight with the police or build barricades in the streets? We answer these daily questions in the Western press as follows: If Reagan were to freeze nuclear weapons in the United States, the peace defenders in the United States would organize a demonstration in support of the U.S. administration. But Reagan has made no such proposal. It was done by Brezhnev, who proposed a ban on the deployment of SS-20 medium-range missiles in Europe. We have ended their deployment and begun a reduction in their numbers without waiting for the agreement of the United States.

Thus, should the Peace Committee, in your view, demonstrate against the government of the country? I think that in Norway, at least, we would not be understood if we started a demonstration against such a proposal by the government. We also support another Soviet decision, the pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

Here are the words of one of the participants of the Peace March. (Tarja Haimikkonen) from Finland said: (?We wish) to thank the Peace Committee for the arrangements for this Peace March; they have been excellent. In Finland there has been a lot of discussion between different groups about whose interests the peace movement serves. There are as many opinions as there are speakers. It has often been said that the Western representatives, or the Western movements, serve the purposes of the Soviet Union and vice versa. It would be very interesting to hear from the representatives of the Peace Committee how the Soviet Peace Committee takes part in peace work outside the Soviet Union, and what kind of peace work they feel is most important outside the borders of their country.

We have described the progress of Peace March 82 in the Soviet Union.

Minsk Rally

PM031301 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jul 82 p 4

[PRAVDA and BELTA correspondents A. Simurov and V. Yanovskiy report: "'We Have Come To Know Each Other Better'; the Peace March-82 Has Ended"]

[Text] Minsk, 29 Jul -- The Belorussian capital bade a warm farewell today to the participants in the Peace March-82 representing the northern countries. The 3 days they spent in the republic were filled with interesting meetings and talks with Soviet peace fighters, activists of the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries, young people and war and labor veterans.

Many of those who made the long journey from Stockholm to Minsk were meeting Soviet people for the first time and of course were not without certain prejudices. They have now reached the conclusion: We have come to know each other better and we have been convinced of the Soviet people's sincere wish to live in peace and friendship with all peoples.

Peace March-82 ended with a big rally of its participants and representatives of the working people of the hero-city of Minsk in the central Gorkiy children's park. It was opened by G.A. Zhukov, chairman of the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace. He said in particular:

"Hundreds of millions of the world's people have joined the movement to say 'No to nuclear death!' We shall win this struggle, but only if we are united. We have many different concepts which do not coincide. We have different views of events taking place in the world,but we have one sacred task on which we have complete unity. We all agree that nuclear war, whether limited, sporadic or prolonged, is madness. Only a madman can think of victory in nuclear war."

"All problems in the world can and must be resolved without violence and without weapons of mass destruction," Finnish representative Aagot Jung said on behalf of the foreign participants in the march. "People of different social groups have gathered in the march. We have conducted a dialogue with understanding, trust and concessions. We have become more mature. We have understood thatthe Soviet Union and its people do not want nuclear war."

On behalf of the Soviet participants in the Peace March-82, K. Proskurnikova, first deputy chairman of the Committee of Soviet Women, expressed the firm conviction that with good will it is possible to surmount the barriers of incomprehension and mistrust, that for all their differences the participants in the antiwar movement can work together for disarmament and peace.

Those taking part in the meeting adopted a joint message to the United Nations and the world's governments, parliaments and people which was read out by Eva Nordland from Norway, one of the initiators of the march. "Our joint march has shown that representatives of public organizations of different countries in East and West can act together and reach agreement in resolving a vitally important problem of all time -- saving mankind from annihilation.

"We urge the United Nations and all governments, parliaments and peoples of the world to act together and reach agreement, as we have done in the Peace March-82."

Text of 'Joint Statement'

PM041121 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Jul 82 p 4

["To the United Nations Organization and the Governments, Parliaments and Peoples of the World. Joint Statement of the Participants in the Peace March-82" -- PRAVDA headline]

[Text] The Stockholm-Helsinki-Moscow-Minsk Peace March-82, which took place 13 through 29 July 1982, is over.

This action was begun by women, who were joined by men, in the united desire to save our planet from destruction. Representatives of public organizations from Nordic countries and the Soviet Union have carried through a joint initiative -- a peace march. It testifies to the whole world that the growing movements for peace in East and West are united in their demands:

No to nuclear weapons in Europe -- West or East!
No to nuclear weapons throughout the world!
Yes to disarmament and peace!

We are convinced that the use of nuclear weapons can never be justified for any reason. Any use of nuclear weapons is a crime against humanity and nature.

We, the participants in the Peace March-82, are agreed that the following steps are necessary to achieve our common objective -- DISARMAMENT AND PEACE [capitals denote boldface as published]:

-- Statements by all countries in the world on no first use of nuclear weapons;

-- The ending of the testing, production and deployment of all types of nuclear weapons and the conclusion of international agreements on monitoring;

--The conclusion of treaties on the creation of nuclear-free zones in West and East Europe and in other parts of the world;

-- The rejection of any proliferation of nuclear weapons;

-- The taking of further concrete steps with a view to the world's development under conditions of greater security, freedom, equality, justice and mutual respect, and using world resources for man's good, not for arms;

-- The elaboration by all governments of a clear concept of peace throughout the world.

Our joint march has shown that representatives of public organizations from different countries in East and West can act together and reach agreement in resolving the vitally important problem of all times -- mankind's salvation from destruction.

We urge the United Nations and all governments, parliaments and peoples of the world to act together and reach agreement, as we have done on the Peace March-82.

The time has come when all governments and parliaments must proceed from words to deeds in the sphere of disarmament.

Together we will triumph!

(The text of the joint statement was discussed and adopted by all the march participants 29 July 1982.)

Events in Kiev

PM041129 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Aug 82 p 1

[TASS report: "For the Sake of a Peaceful Future"]

[Text] Kiev, 1 Aug -- The participants in the Moscow-to-Vienna Peace March-82 began their route today from the monument to fallen servicemen which rises above Victory Square.

Calls to put an end to an arms race fraught with the danger of a thermonuclear explosion rang out at the large rally in which the procession ended on Lenin Komsomol Square. Opening the rally, S. Kirillova, director of the Kiev branch of the Central Museum of V.I. Lenin, recalled that the CSCE Final Act signed in Helsinki 7 years ago meets a living response in the minds and hearts of millions of honest people on the planet. We who know the horrors of war want peace. Evidence of this, she noted, is provided by the numerous peace initiatives of our state and Comrade L.I. Brezhnev personally, including the USSR's pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, which has met with tremendous approval from the world public.

The guarantee of success lies in unity of actions. This idea permeated the speeches of Gordon Shaffer, chairman of the British Committee for European Security and Cooperation and holder of International Lenin Prize "For Strengthening Peace Between Peoples," (Daniel Bentim), representative of the peace-loving public of Ghana; Denise Young, member of the U.S. Peace Council; and Gerard Ali, representative of the National Council of the French Movement for Peace.

On the same day the guests made a tour of the city, saw its areas of new construction and viewed the historical and cultural monuments of the Ukrainian capital.

In the Park of Eternal Glory the participants in the march laid flowers at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.

IUS Message

LD032026 Moscow TASS in English 1956 GMT 3 Aug 82

[Text] Prague August 3 TASS -- All people of goodwill are declaring their resolute "no" to war and the arms race, to the deployment in Western Europe of new types of American missile-nuclear weapons, says the appeal by the Secretariat of the International Union of Students [IUS] addressed to the participants in the Peace March-82.

As the CETEKA agency reports, the document says that the sole way to saving our planet from destruction is through putting an end to the arms race and eliminating the threat of nuclear war.

Rally in CSSR

LD040836 Moscow TASS in English 0810 GMT 4 Aug 82

[Text] Bratislava August 4 TASS -- TASS Correspondent Vladimir Mikhalchenko reports:

People of the towns and villages of Czechoslovakia are meeting by cordial greetings a group of participants in the Peace March-82 on the way from Moscow to Vienna. A large anti-war meeting of representatives of the working people and youth was held in Banska Bystrica, the main town of the central Slovak region, in the central square named the Anti-Fascist Slovak National Uprising.

"A serious threat of atomic war is looming over the world, but people of good will have enough strength and energy to oppose this threat and avert the catastrophe", representative of the National Federation of Indian Women Sarla Sharma said at the meeting. "The evidence of this is also our march in which people from more than 20 countries are participating, the support we are given. We wish to make it plain to the U.S. imperialists threatening peace with neutron bombs that their policy of the heightening of tension is doomed to failure. Peoples of Europe and Asia, of the whole world need peace and they declare resolutely for disarmament, say the firm 'no' to nuclear weapons".

Member of the National Council of the French Peace Movement Alain Charbonnier said: "It is time to remove all that hampers normal relations among peoples, that warms the course of detente. It is particularly necessary now to widen economic, cultural, scientific and technological cooperation among countries on the basis of mutual understanding and equality. The flight of a French cosmonaut on board a Soviet spaceship was an example of such fruitful cooperation."

The peace marchers will arrive in Bratisalava tomorrow.

BOLSHAKOV IN PRAVDA 'INTERNATIONAL REVIEW'

PM031405 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Aug 82 p 4

[Vladimir Bolshakov untitled 'International Review']

[Text] Lebanon's Tragedy

On 30 July, a meeting was held in the Crimea between L.I. Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and G. Husak, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee and president of the CSSR. The Near East situation was among the questions discussed. The USSR and the CSSR most resolutely denounce Israel's criminal aggression against sovereign Lebanon and the Palestinian people as they do Washington's overt connivance with Tel Aviv. Unable to break the resistance of Beirut's defenders, the aggressor, casting off all diplomacy, is counting exclusively on military force.

The eighth cease-fire agreement was concluded, with difficulty, by the evening of 30 July, but the very next morning the Israeli carrion crows had reappeared over west Beirut. "Israel does not intend to observe this agreement," an Israeli Command spokesman told AFP. The West Bank is almost daily being bombarded directly from the air, sea and ground. A refugee camp in Sabra was shelled recently. Phosphorus and antipersonnel bombs are being used again.

Each minute is fraught with the danger of a new bomb attack. Every day the number of victims of the genocide Israel is perpetrating in Lebanon against the Palestinians and the Lebanese increases -- tens of thousands of civilians have already been killed, wounded or maimed and about 1 million people have lost their homes.

The associations with fascist atrocities are so visible and obvious that even the leaders of international Zionism such as Nahum Goldmann, former president of the World Jewish Congress, are hastening to dissociate themselves from the fascist Begin-Sharon clique which rules in Tel Aviv and are asserting that Zionism has nothing in common with it.

That is a lie aimed at simpletons and ill-informed people and an attempt to whitewash Zionism which was declared by the United Nations as early as 1975 to be "a form of racism and racial discrimination." The policy of genocide now implemented in Lebanon by the Zionists is inseparable from Zionism as the ideology and criminal practice of the Jewish grande bourgeoisie.

The "Peace for Galilee" operation, as the Israeli aggression against Lebanon has been called, has broken all previous records for barbarity and ferocity. Whole cities -- Sidon, Tyre, a considerable part of Beirut, 13 Palestinian villages and 14 refugee camps -- have been wiped from the face of the earth. In their place the Israeli military has rapidly created concentration camps like Hitler's with electrified barbed wire.

The initiators of the creation of the international tribunal for the investigation of Israel's crimes in Lebanon note that there is already every reason to accuse Israel of war crimes condemned by international law, including deliberate bomb attacks on the civilian population, the use of barbaric means of destroying people such as phosphorus and antipersonnel bombs, the bombing of military and civilian hospitals protected by the emblems of the Red Cross and Red Crescent (this week, for instance, a ship with this emblem that had come to Lebanon from the FRG was bombed), the refusal to grant prisoner of war status to the Palestinian resistance fighters, and harsh treatment of them, including torture....

It is clear that Israel could not have committed all these crimes were it not for such a powerful patron -- the United States.

On the evening of 28 July, President Reagan addressed a New York press conference. To a question about the situation in Lebanon he replied: "We would like perhaps more than anything in the world for the bloodshed and killing to stop."

It emerges that the present U.S. administration is addressing such an unfocused wish not to the Zionist military but...to the PLO which has been recognized by the United Nations as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people but has not been recognized by Israel or the United States which call the PLO nothing but a "terrorist group." It transpires, if we are to follow the pro-Israeli logic of the White House and of Mr Habib, its special representative in the Near East, that the PLO is to blame for the fact that Beirut is being reduced to ruins because it "does not want to leave it" and that no blame at all is attached to the Israeli military which has invaded Lebanon and for 2 months now has been systematically and barbarically shelling and bombing its capital.

Attempts are being made to present the tragedy of Beirut to world public opinion as something like a perfectly "legitimate operation" to free an aircraft with hostages seized by terrorists. In this cheap scenario, west Beirut is assigned the role of the "aircraft," the PLO the role of "bloodthirsty terrorists" while the real terrorist, Begin, is assigned the noble role of leader of the team to combat terrorism. The hostages are peace in the Near East and the future of Lebanon. Mr Habib naturally acts as the "intermediary" between the "terrorists" and the "antiterrorists."

Just one thing remains -- for all Palestinians to leave Lebanon (and that means nothing more nor less than the evacuation of almost 600,000 people) -- and then "peace for Galilee" and Lebanon will prevail.

The falsity of this scenario is borne out if only by the fact that the "impartial intermediaries" in the shape of representatives of the Reagan administration act exclusively from the pro-Israeli positions which provide for a Zionist-style "final solution" to the Palestinian question. The question of the creation of a national Palestinian state is not raised. On the contrary, Mr Habib is suggesting to the PLO a Palestinian "diaspora," that is, the dispersal of the Palestinian people's dream of returning to the motherland that was taken from them. No haste is being made to withdraw Israeli troops. The Tel Aviv administration, removing the Lebanese organs of power from the running of the country, is already throwing its full weight around on occupied Lebanese soil. Branches of Israeli banks are operating, Israeli currency is circulating and smuggling and looting are rife. Things have even reached the point where Israel, in its haste to profit from the aggression, is organizing tours of occupied Lebanon!

As the foreign territory is being assimilated, preparation is also underway for its "Camp Davidization." Candidates are being selected for the post of future premier of Lebanon's pro-Israeli and pro-U.S. government. The details of a U.S.-Israeli plan for the future political structure of the Near East have become known. According to this plan, Lebanon's participation is envisaged. It is hoped to involve Jordan and Syria by force in the Camp David process. The United States intends to use its expeditionary corps comprising 4,500 men from the Rapid Deployment Forces as a "guarantee of peace" in the Near East. What is this if not a repetition of the operation the United States undertook in 1958 to occupy Lebanon and create a bridgehead for the Pentagon there?

The U.S. administration's attempts to retain the mien of a "disinterested party" here are another instance of hypocrisy. Only the other day State Department spokesman Fischer asserted that accusations that the United States had "given its tacit consent to the bombing of Beirut are absolutely unfair." Enough, Mr Fischer! The United States has frequently demonstrated this consent in the United Nations by vetoing the Security Council resolutions demanding the immediate withdrawal of Israeli troops from Lebanon. It is the United States who has given Tel Aviv sophisticated weapons for aggression against that country including weapons even the U.S. Air Force does not have! That includes weapons that are rightly called "weapons of genocide" -- antipersonnel and phosphorus bombs. U.S. Senator Pell was right to say that "the death of every child in Lebanon, the destruction of every building reduced to a rubble heap is the result of the use of U.S. weapons."

The United States is the direct accomplice of the crime of genocide perpetrated by Israel and is an active accomplice of the aggressor who has become the U.S. gendarme in the Near East. Israel's aggression has been carried out with the permission and active participation of the United States and the Reagan administration directly. All U.S. policy in the Near East corresponds with Israeli policy and is adapted to it. This is now understood even by traditionally pro-U.S. Arab regimes. Israeli aggression in Lebanon and the extermination of the Palestinians is the result not least of the lack of unity in the Arab world and of illusions that Washington is pursuing a policy in the Near East that takes into account the interests of both Israel and "friendly" Arab countries. The tragedy of Lebanon and the Palestinians has shown the worth of Washington's "friendship." It will result in tragedy for the Arabs on many occasions unless the world community is able to curb the aggressor and his overseas accomplice.

At the meeting in the Crimea between Comrades L.I. Brezhnev and G. Husak it was noted that there is not and cannot be a Near East settlement on the paths of Israel's annexation of Arab territories and the war of extermination against the Palestinian people and of separate deals and machinations. The Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia demand an immediate end to Israeli aggression in Lebanon and the lifting of the barbaric siege of its capital -- Beirut. They come out in support of a firm and just political settlement of the Near East crisis taking into account the rights and lawful interests of all peoples of this region.

The Hypocritical Janus From Washington

The present U.S. administration's hypocrisy has already become a favorite long-standing theme of foreign cartoonists. The face of Washington's hypocritical Janus turned toward the socialist world is constantly distorted by ferocious grimaces of anger over the "violation" of "human rights" there. With its other face turned to its beloved clients from the ranks of the fascist juntas and cliques, Washington is reminiscent of the physiognomy of an optimist with an ear-to-ear grin advertizing toothpaste: Everything seems to be in order in the "free world" where any butcher will receive an indulgence from the White House for his crimes so long as he serves the interests of U.S. imperalism.

U.S. Congress recently received President Reagan's report on El Salvador that asserted that the authorities of the country have achieved "progress" in the human rights sphere. The administration needed the report to reassure congressmen concerned by the reports of the Salvadoran fascist junta's atrocities and to push through another law on deliveries of new consignments of weapons to the junta.

The report is false from beginning to end, which is admitted even by the U.S. bourgeois press. According to the figures of the U.S. civil liberties defense league, the number of the regime's victims has been more than 3,000 in only the first 6 months of this year. In El Salvador, the New York TIMES writes, up to 500 people continue to die every month; the "death squads" are just as active and hundreds of political prisoners are in jail.

One more example of official Washington's hypocrisy: From 19 through 26 July the White House strenuously hurled thunder and lightning at the socialist countries. The Enslaved Peoples Week proclaimed by President Reagan was in progress.

A statement by a Polish Government official on the subject states:

In connection with the fact that the Washington administration's plans to undermine from within the socialist system in Poland have failed, the Polish people have been proclaimed the most "enslaved." However, the enslaved peoples do not include the Palestinians despite the fact that it was precisely during this "week" that the Israeli Army shelled Beirut, killing Palestinian refugees, women and children, for Israel's aggressive man-hating armed actions do not contradict the goals of U.S. foreign policy. Nor do the enslaved peoples include the Chilean people, because with the aid of the United States the democratic government of President Allende was overthrown in Ch'le. Nor are the "peace champions" in the White House troubled by the actions of the White authorities of the Republic of South Africa against the African population.

In the White House, President Reagan himself opened the Enslaved Peoples Week, based on this kind of "political morality." His calls for a "crusade" against communism resounded again.

Yet many people in the United States are now starting to think about where this "campaign" and the administration heading it will lead the U.S. people.

"You form the impression," the Baltimore SUN writes, "that Reagan's America is perfectly prepared to state that it intends to listen only to its own drummer, letting the rest of the world go to hell."

Washington is calling its allies to cold war and total confrontation with the socialist world. All those who oppose this, in the opinion of Reagan's company commanders, "are out of line." The recalcitrant are even being threatened with the application of U.S. laws as in the case of the U.S. "veto" on the "gas-for-pipes" deal whose dissolution would cost West Europe thousands of jobs and hundreds of millions of dollars. For the United States, the curtailment of business ties with the socialist community is also fraught with the danger of losses just as great. That is the other side of anticommunism in its present Washington form. History could teach the present "crusaders" how anticommunism ends.

"For over three decades now," the New York TIMES recently wrote, "we have been containing the spread of Soviet might and influence with the aid of military means. We have experienced two wars, two periods of military hysteria and two periods of 'lagging behind.' We have sacrificed the lives of thousands of Americans and a considerable proportion of our national resources to contain the Soviet Union. Now we intend to spend about another $1 trillion to eliminate the existing third 'lag.'"

In the newspaper article you can sense the serious anxiety of very influential U.S. circles at the political rashness and impudence of the present administration. Through the New York TIMES they are warning the administration that there are no grounds for stating that "the Soviet Union is advancing toward the garbage heap of history." On the contrary, its successes are imposing. And it must be considered that "the Russians have achieved their greatest successes in a period of indisputable U.S. military superiority." The conclusion is unambiguous: The U.S. attempt to achieve military superiority is now a chimera. The call by sober Americans to renounce bellicose anticommunism and return to the period of detente in relations between our states is a timely one. It is the only reliable guideline toward the conservation of peace and life on our planet. Unfortunately, Washington's hypocritical Janus is still looking in the opposite direction with both its faces.

ZAGLADIN INTERVIEWED ON CURRENT WORLD EVENTS

LD301856 Prague Domestic Service in Czech and Slovak 1410 GMT 30 Jul 82

[Interview with Vadim Zagladin, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department, by Prague radio editor Josef Nyvlt, in Prague; time not given; in Russian fading into superimposed Czech translation -- recorded]

[Text] [Question] The current American administration under President Reagan has been attempting from the very outset to upset the existing balance, gain global superiority and push through its so-called vital interests in all parts of the world. This has naturally had a big influence on the development of mutual relations between the Soviet Union and the United States and is projected in all spheres, including economics. The whole complex of problems is now linked with the American economic sanctions against the gas pipeline from Siberia to Western Europe. What does it mean in your opinion? What has provoked the American opposition to the construction of the gas pipeline?

[Answer] This is a complicated question because what is at issue here is not one but many objectives.

The first objective is the struggle against socialism -- the main component of the U.S. strategy. The main task has been to prevent the strengthening of the economy of the Soviet Union and of other socialist countries. I have seen some American documents in which it has been said, among other things, that thwarting construction of the gas pipeline would mean above all thwarting supplies to the socialist countries. They are serious about this, although they probably understand, on the other hand, that we shall not permit this. This is, therefore, an attempt to weaken the economy of the Soviet Union and of other socialist countries and this is the same objective which is pursued by stepping up the feverish arms build-up.

The task of the present-day feverish arms build-up in its contemporary context is naturally not a preparation for war alone -- an immediate one at least -- but it constitutes at the same time an economic pressure on our countries. Here one must say directly that such calculations are based on very inaccurate initial data.

From what premise do the Americans proceed? In their view, the economy of socialism has found itself in a state, if not of crisis, then in any case it is undergoing extraordinary difficulties. We know well our difficulties, jointly with you. We know that problems exist, complex problems which we are tackling, and time will be needed to resolve them. We all understand this. One has to say that this has been met with total understanding on the part of the citizens of the Soviet Union and, as I have been able to see, also on the part of the Czechoslovak citizens.

They are truly problems which have to be tackled collectively, jointly and turned into the affair of all the people. They are, however, not problems of a nature which could provoke a crisis in our economy. What is involved here is altogether something different. These are questions of development on a new basis. This is truly complicated matter which no one has tackled before.

On the other hand, the real possibilities of the socialist economy are immense and one cannot depricate them in any way. The Americans however do not see these possibilities and it would appear that they do not understand them either. They proceed from their own economic system and from their own possibilities, from the system of private enterprise.

You know, there is an anecdote: A northerner came to a zoo and saw a giraffe. He looked at it, looked for while and then said: This cannot be. And this is also the case as far as the Americans and their private enterprise are concerned. When they come to our countries and see what they themselves are unable to sort out in their minds, they also say: This cannot be. They are, however, doing even worse: They are not saying merely that this cannot be but are building on a policy of that which can be. Thus they believe that there must be a crisis in our country because they apply their own criteria that will give them their own result.

[Question] Regarding the concrete case of the pipeline, we know the Soviet answer, including the answer of the gas pipeline builders. A concrete question arises: Whom wil the American embargo hurt?

[Answer] Well, that is just the point we are coming to now. You know, in this particular case they wanted to harm us but have not caused us any harm. To some extent the Americans anticipated this and yet wanted to cause this harm to their allies. There is no doubt that the American measure, the purpose of which is to prevent the construction of the gas pipeline, is aimed against U.S. allies. The situation is such that the Americans, in comparison with Western Europe and Japan, are losing positions. Western Europe and Japan, despite all the economic difficulties they have, are gaining. The balance of economic power between Western Europe, Japan and the United States is changing to the detriment of the United States. American capitalism is trying to change this situation. At the moment, various wars are under way -- the steel war, the customs duty war, the currency war -- which are aimed against Western Europe. To all this they are now adding the measures against the pipeline. In a word, such was the intention.

But the Americans did not expect that they could be harmed by it, too, although they are now actually causing harm to themselves. You know that there are various calculations specifying how many billions are being lost by the American companies which could have participated in this project, how much they have already lost to date. The figures differ but the basic fact is always the same: The United States will suffer losses, and not only the immediate losses caused by their nonparticipation in the construction of the gas pipeline. There are also indirect losses caused by the complications affecting U.S. allies.

[Question] In connection with the U.S. decision to extend the embargo to West European firms, too, the differences between the United States and West European countries have, to an unprecedented extent, come to the surface again. How do you view this phenomenon that was recently described by Helmut Schmidt as a "family conflict"?

[Answer] Yes, I think that to some extent the embargo has been reflected in this, but it is not just a question of the embargo. You know that the situation at the moment is such that U.S. interests, the interests of its ruling groups, including its allies, include a great number of issues.

The first group of questions, even those which are not connected with economy, concern disarmament and detente. The point is that economic questions and cooperation amount to just a part of the problem connected with detente. Regarding the questions of disarmament, confrontation or, on the contrary, peaceful cooperation, their stances differ more and more. Although U.S. allies are trying very hard to be loyal and to observe, so to speak, "Atlantic discipline" and to act jointly with the United States wherever possible, all this is ever harder for them, above all because the public in these countries, the public in the broadest sense -- from the big economic capital to the working class -- for various reasons is against confrontation and against feverish armaments build-up; above all because the public understands that a military conflict, let alone one conducted with nuclear weapons, would mean tragic destruction for Europe.

Secondly, conflicts are arising in connection with contacts with the East both in the general sense and as a part of the question of coexistence and detente. In the last decade, say in the last 10-15 years, West Europe has gradually become used to certain cooperation with the socialist countries. Although the extent of this cooperation is not perhaps particularly great it has nonetheless become a sufficiently formulated phenomenon which, even in the conditions of general instability in the capitalist world, makes it possible to keep a certain proportion of the market stable. One leading representative of the Austrian Socialist Party told me: You know, for us the socialist countries are a reliable and stable means of support that we take advantage of with unfortunately only one leg because the other leg is suspended in the air; if someone removes the support from beneath the one stable leg we will probably collapse completely.

Last there is the U.S. policy toward other parts of the world -- the Near East, developing countries in general, Africa and Latin America. In spite of the greatest desire to maintain some kind of Western unity, this is not succeeding because attitudes are divergent. There are moments where attitudes are coincide, for example Great Britain and the United States during the Malvinas Islands crisis. However this was primarily because the United States wanted to use this conflict for its own interests. If that had not been the case, if the United States had -- let us assume absurd though it may be -- but let us assume that the United States had displayed loyalty to the Organization of American States and sided with Argentina; there certainly would also have been a clash of attitudes. However, as is known, nothing of the kind happened. Incidentally, that is a lesson to be learned.

Thus there are divergent attitudes concerning the whole complex of relations between Europe and America. One component of this is the problem of lack of agreement between various imperialist groupings with differing interests. However, I think that to phrase the question in this way is now probably insufficient; it is not precise enough. Why?

The issues which relate to the controversy concern the prospects of the West as a whole, the prospects of the capitalist system. They are the issues of competition with socialism, problems of the future development of world relations in its entirety. The others are merely partial questions of this problem.

Reagan and his administratior -- and I deliberately do not say the United States since there are various internal groupings -- Reagan and his administration represent that part of the capitalist world of monopoly capital, which is convinced that the solution of questions of the future, of problems of mutual relations between the two systems, can be achieved only by means of force. Circles currently in the leadership of a substantial part of European countries take a completely different viewpoint. It is not easy for them but they give preference to a peaceful development of relations and to solving questions by competition in a peaceful atmosphere.

Of course, on the other hand they live in hope. They believe and will continue to believe that in peaceful conditions they might be able to undermine our countries from within: in short, to realize the line which they have been following for a long time. However, taking all advantages and disadvantages into account, when we compare these concepts it is quite obvious that in current conditions in the nuclear age the old line is more viable and more realistic, while Reagan's line completely disregards the current situation, the correlation of forces; in short it takes nothing at all into account.

In my view precisely these difficulties described as a "family quarrel" by Herr Schmidt are an extremely serious and profound matter which will have far-reaching consequences.

Concerning the U.S., I shall return to what I have already said: Reagan's policy is not very farsighted. They continuously speak about safeguarding U.S. interests; however how are they safeguarding them? In my view, the U.S. situation today is worse than a year ago. If there were now a commission for investigating un-American activities in the United States, I think its members should summon the President to explain why he conducts an essentially anti-American policy.

[Question] Let us return once more to relations between the Soviet Union and the United States. How do you view the prospects for these relations in the immediate future?

[Answer] To be quite frank, it is difficult to say. As far as we are concerned, I can be quite precise: We shall continue in all ongoing talks and shall strive to ensure that they bring positive results. We regret and we are also indignant that the United States has suspended certain talks. For instance, quite recently President Reagan suspended talks on the prohibition of nuclear tests. Similarly, they do not intend to reopen or continue contacts we have been maintaining even during very difficult periods. We shall insist that the various contacts and talks be continued, that ways are found toward the normalization of our mutual relations. Pesonally I do not have any illusions. I understand that ideal relations with the United States cannot be established in the current period. They can, however, be improved and I hope that they will improve. I do not know whether they will improve under this administration or under the following one but they will certainly improve.

There is, however, one thing through which the present administration has harmed its own country and which will be difficult to remedy. We do not have great confidence in the United States as a partner. It does not keep its word in the political and economic -- commercial -- sense of the word. Naturally one cannot get along with such a partner; but since we understand the importance of relations with the United States, we shall be striving for their normalization.

[Question] The most explosive area of the world today is the Middle East. It is known that the Soviet Union, since the very beginning of the so-called Middle East problem, has been persistent in proposing a comprehensive approach to the issues of this region. This stance was reiterated in recent statements made by Leonid Ilich Brezhnev. What is your view on the chances of this solution from the viewpoint of the current course of events?

[Answer] I could say a lot here, but the first thing I would like to discuss is the indignation at the enormous audacity with which Israel has been pursuing its line in the Middle East -- that is, Israel jointly with the United States. If we took the last 37 postwar years, then this war is the most horrific from all points of view. In the first place, it is an aggression against a sovereign country. The aggressor is besieging a capital in which a government is sitting, and simultaneously it has virtually annexed a part of that country and introduced its own authorities, its own money and its own language there. It has even forbidden the Lebanese to speak in their own mother tongue, or it no longer takes any note of that language.

Furthermore this is real genocide. The statements and testimonies of our Palestinian friends are well known, for instance those of Comrade 'Arafat and many observers who have been there about the employment of the kinds of weapons forbidden by international law. It is a war that is conducted while totally ignoring UN resolutions and the views of the public, including a considerable section of the Israeli public, for in Isreal itself protests against this war are continually becoming more powerful. It is not merely the Communist Party that is fighting against this war with great courage: Many Israeli allies, both close and distant, and a section of bourgeois officials are also against it. Even in the Israeli Armed Forces there are now forces who actively oppose this war.

When we view this war in its entirety and when we think about and read through, let us say, the decisions of the Nuremberg tribunal, the trial of the principal Nazi war criminals, then we conclude that what is practiced here is a whole system of crimes against humanity. Here a question arises, or at least it comes to my mind: How and with what can one explain the fact that Israel, a state whose people suffered so much during World War II, is now carrying out the very same policy of shameless aggression, genocide and the like. There is probably only one explanation: The people of Israel themselves, the Jewish nation, bear no guilt in this case. It is not their war; this is not the war of a nation, it is the war of a system, of an imperialist state, which leans on the assistance and support of the main imperialist country.

The goal pursued by the Americans in this conflict is a special issue on its own, but the very fact that they make a full contribution to the war is beyond discussion. By the way, recently RUDE PRAVO disclosed information about the U.S. contribution to Israeli war expenditures: It is almost 1/3. If we add voluntary contributions to this it will be still more, so it is quite clear that it is not a purely Israeli war. I would like to repeat this absolutely clearly: Without the United States this war would not have been. This war is part of the current strategy of imperialism.

There is one more thing which also stands out which I would like to emphasize: The unprecedented courage of the Palestinians -- a nation which has found itself in a shockingly complex situation, a nation which is being exterminated in all possible ways and yet it defends its cause, its life, its existence and in fact also the cause of peace. The point is that it fights against aggression in the most immediate meaning of the word. It fights with unprecedented self-sacrifices. It is not just a question of self-sacrifices, for the Palestinian solders and the fighters of the national patriotic forces of Lebanon successfully fight against an army equipped with the most modern weapons, I repeat, the most modern! There is nothing more modern than the weapons supplied to Israel, not even in the United States itself.

[Question] The most important thing for a comprehensive solution of the fundamental problems of the Near East is the implementation of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. What forces can contribute to the implementation of these rights?

[Answer] Both the Palestinians and the Near East question have two aspects. There is the international-political and diplomatic aspect, and the sociopolitical and class aspect. I think that above all, regarding the Palestinian question, one must take into account both these aspects and assess them separately. As regards the international-political aspect of the matter now, in our view -- Leonid Ilich Brezhnev spoke about this in his interview with PRAVDA -- there are three gradual task which must be solved and various forces can contribute to the realization of these tasks.

The first task is to put an end to the siege of Beirut. This means putting an end to so shameful a fact as the beseiging of the capital city of a sovereign state. The disengagement of the armies can be achieved with the use of the UN forces already legitimately stationed in the area but never with American or any other intervention forces. This is the first stage, the most urgent one at the moment.

The second stage is to stop the war, the withdrawal of the aggressor's forces from Lebanon. This can be achieved with the participation of the Security Council members, the UN secretary general and with all interested parties. But the main role in this case would be played by the UN Security Council and its permanent members, the UN Security Council being the main peace-keeping institution.

The third stage is the final settlement at the center of which, naturally, is the question of Palestine. We see the most reliable solution of this question in setting up a Palestinian state. At the same time, other aspects of the matter must be taken into account; conditions of peace and security for all countries and nations in the area, including Israel, must be truly ensured.

So, this final, third stage presupposed the participation of a broad circle of forces, not only of the Security Council but, above all, of all the countries of this area, of all interested parties, the participants in the conflict and their neighbors. Naturally the participation of the Palestinians themselves would be involved. I would like to point out that we, our party, at its 26th congress, proposed the convening of a conference on the Near East with the participation of the interested countries and all other countries which would like to participate. This idea has now been confirmed by Leonid Ilich Brezhnev in his interview in PRAVDA.

Let us now have a look at the socioplitical and class aspect of this question. The Near East is a complicated area as regards its composition and the composition of its countries. There are countries such as Syria with a socialist orientation. There are countries with openly reactionary regimes and there are countries occupying a position somewhere in between.

In all this conglomerate of countries a special place belongs to the Palestinian movement of resistance, the Palestinian people. A special place because it is a nation without its own state, without its own country, a nation that is denied the right to independent existence, a nation that is forced to live as a guest of other Arab countries. This movement is the most radical detachment of the national liberation movement in the Near East as a whole and it is radical in the best sense of the word.

Radical movements can be of various kinds; in this case it is a matter of a radical movement of a revolutionary-democratic type that strives for the solution of its nationality problem and at the same time puts forward important social ideas, ideas for the setting up of a state which would be a democratic state; it advocates the democratization of international relations in this area. That is to say that the leadership of the Palestinian resistance movement is advancing a democratic program as regards both internal and foreign policy questions.

Thus, the struggle currently waged around the Palestinian problem is not only a struggle of Israel for a greater Israel; it is also a struggle, or if you perfer, it is part of the international class struggle which concerns the fate of social development throughout the Near East. The Palestinians, the most progressive current in this shere, are an obstacle for the Americans, for their plans, for their strategy. American strategy pursues various aims here: strategic aims, oil aims. It is a very good vantage point; they want to check on their allies from here. Naturally, all this is generally aimed against the socialist countries.

American strategy in the Near East pursues as one of its main aims the creation of a solid area as regards the socia' side [as heard], that is to say it strives to suppress all progressive forces. In this sense the struggle against the Palestinians is the most important part of the American plan.

[Question] How is all this reflected in the stands of Arab countries with regard to these problems and to the current conflict?

[Answer] To the reactionary forces of the Near East itself, the Palestine resistance movement is no ally, it is a nuisance. It does not suit many people. This is perhaps why there is presently not the necessary unity among Arab countries, not only because the countries are different but also because the Palestinian resistance movement has a democratic character which does not suit many people.

However, it seems to me that the peoples of the Arab countries of this region are in great danger today. They should discard all secondary questions which concern the future and concentrate on the threat from the aggressor, because in the final analysis this threat is a threat to any Arab country in this area. Neither Jordan, nor Saudi Arabia, nor Kuwait -- none can feel safe from the imperialist threat. That is the main thing to be taken into account and to be acted upon.

[Question] Vadim Valentinovich, we have discussed a number of topical questions of the present-day world and of course we could discuss many more. In concluding this interview could you recapitulate and give a general assessment of the current international situation.

[Answer] We have indeed touched upon many questions. Each of them shows that the overall world situation is complex and strained. However, I would say that an unprecedently new situation has come about. It is not merely a question of tension in the international sphere, of a crisis situation in international relations. There are completely new elements.

Let us recall the past. We went through the period of cold war, let us say Cold War I. It was then quite clear that socialism, the democratic forces, were on the defensive. Imperialism tried to attack and even achieved sometning then. There was then a time when, in turn, the forces of social liberation and national liberation were advancing and winning great victories and imperialism had to retreat.

How are we to assess the current stage? Who is on the defensive and who on the offensive? This is very complex, don't you think? Let us put it this way: Imperialism is trying to lead a counteroffensive and to attack where it can. Yes, it is trying to and is doing so much more energetically than ever before. However, is it possible to say that socialism and the forces of national liberation are retreating? By no means. What is more they are not only retreating and defending themselves, they are also striving to counterattack and attack.

The peace offensive of our community continues and we are tabling ever new proposals. It is sufficient to look at the latest session of the UN General Assembly: The West is weak; it has no proposals. All the proposals come from our community, from individual countries or collective groups, or they originate from developing countries, again either jointly with us or individually. The West has proposed nothing. In this sense one cannot speak of retreat. This applies to what we said about the Near East, about the situation in other parts of the world where there are crisis situations. We emphasised that patriots, national liberation and freedom fighters have not given up anywhere. On the contrary they are successfully struggling everywhere.

Both sides are attacking; there is great activity on both sides like waves heading towards each other. In my view this can be explained by the fact that a new unique, unrepeatable balance of power has come about in the world, characterized by an equilibrium in the military-strategic sphere between imperialism and socialism, by an enhanced activity of anti-imperialist forces and by a growth of these forces. That means a state of equilibrium accompanied by a growth in anti-imperialist potential. This unusual balance of forces, this equilibrium, has made it possible for such an unusual situation to occur in the international sphere whereby two waves advance from both sides and collide; that naturally results at times in a rather complicated situation.

We know from conversations with our Soviet people, from letters to the Central Committee, to our papers and periodicals that reactions to these phenomena are diverse.

I know that here in Czechoslovakia, although I have not been here for long -- maybe because I understand Czech a little -- reactions are roughly the same, our peoples have approximately the same approach to these matters. Extreme views exist; there are people who say that the situation is so complex and difficult that there is no way out, that only the worst can be expected, that we are on the very threshold of war. That of course is an extreme view and is incorrect because there are a number of positive factors; the head-on struggle and existing equilibrium of forces is a guarantee that we can advance and not allow imperialism to realize its plans.

On the other hand there are some people who say that there have been all kinds of crises, this will pass, too. We are strong; we have the strength of the Soviet Union, the strength of the socialist countries; it will all pass of its own accord. It will not pass of its own accord; of course that, too, is incorrect.

Yes, without doubt we are capable of defending ourselves, of rebuffing the imperialist wave, but that depends on us, on the situation of our countries and in our countries, on the unity of our countries and their joint activity in the international arena. We cannot answer for others but we can for ourselves.

We in the Soviet Union are convinced that every citizen of our Soviet land, and, I believe, every citizen of the socialist community can enhance the possibilities of the world by his honest work, each at his place. In our country and here in Czechoslovakia, too, this meets with the understanding of the majority of people. I have met many people and noted with pleasure that nothing is small, all deeds are great. In the final analysis, all deeds are placed on the scales of the world and the more of them there are, the heavier the scale, the easier we shall outweigh those who strive for a different development.

## ANNIVERSARY OF HELSINKI CONFERENCE NOTED

PRAVDA Editorial

PM031435 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Aug 82 p 1

[Editorial: "Europe Day"]

[Text] People of good will are celebrating Europe Day today. Seven years ago in Helsinki the leaders of 33 European countries, the United States and Canada signed the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, which was a major event in postwar history. The all-European conference not only summed up the political results of World War II and confirmed the sterility and fallaciousness of the "from-a-position-of-strength" policy but also created broad opportunities for consolidating peace and the people's security.

The Final Act is rightly called a code for peaceful coexistence. It proclaims the fundamental principles governing relations among states with different social systems -- namely, the sovereign equality of states, the nonuse of force or threats thereof, the inviolability of borders, territorial integrity, the peaceful settlement of disputes, noninterference in each other's internal affairs, respect for human rights and basic freedoms, equality and the peoples' right to be their own master, interstate cooperation and the honoring of commitments in accordance with international law.

The Final Act formulates a broad and clear platform of action by states to consolidate European security and develop peaceful cooperation in various spheres.

It is significant that it was on European soil that detente put down its deepest roots in the seventies. The fabric of mutually advantageous cooperation among states with different social systems in the sphere of economics, culture, education, the environment, and contacts between people was broadened and strengthened. Our business links with neutral and nonaligned countries like Finland, Austria, Malta, Cyprus, the FRG, France, Greece, Turkey and other states are developing favorably. Good-neighborly contacts must continue to serve the cause of strengthening the foundations of peace in Europe.

In recent years, however, the aggressive forces of imperialism have been crusading against detente. Flagrantly contravening the spirit and the letter of the Final Act, the United States and some of its NATO partners have been doing their utmost to fan international tension and accelerate the arms race and to try and revive the "cold war." Washington has been erecting artificial barriers in order to block the development of normal economic and other ties between the capitalist states of West Europe and the socialist community countries. The Pentagon's plans to deploy new U.S. nuclear missiles on this continent are aimed at undermining the military equilibrium between NATO and the Warsaw Pact and pose an enormous threat for both this region and the world as a whole. The United States and its allies are bent on turning the meeting in Madrid of those states that took part in the all-European conference into an arena of confrontation and are trying to block its successful conclusion.

At the meeting in the Crimea between L.I. Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and G. Husak, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee and president of the CSSR, it was noted that the results of the Helsinki Conference held 7 years ago have by no means been nullified by the development of the situation in Europe and the world. Quite the reverse: The more troubled the international climate, the more manifest the full import of the Helsinki Final Act becomes. The Madrid meeting's successful conclusion and, above all, its adoption of a decision to convene a conference on confidence-building measures, security and disarmament in Europe could be a worthy reaffirmation of the spirit of Helsinki.

The Soviet and other socialist community countries are setting a good example of scrupulous adherence to all of the Final Act's provisions. The USSR was the first to incorporate in its Constitution and thus enshrine in law the 10 fundamental principles of interstate relations proclaimed at the all-European conference. The Soviet state is doing all in its power to preserve detente and everything positive achieved in the seventies.

The Peace Program for the Eighties adopted by the 26th CPSU Congress outlines large-scale measures aimed at reducing the level of military confrontation on the European Continent.

In the course of implementing the Peace Program the Soviet Union has been launching constructive new initiatives on military detente. Our country's fundamental peaceableness was convincingly demonstrated by its pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons announced in Comrade L.I. Brezhnev's message to the second UN General Assembly special session on disarmament and by the proposals contained in the memorandum submitted for its examination.

The USSR is prepared to negotiate an agreement on ridding Europe of all nuclear weapons and is willing to reach an agreement whereby the parties completely renounce all medium-range nuclear devices. We are also agreeable to the idea of a phased and very substantial reduction of such arms. The land of the soviets underpins its proposals with practical good-will gestures. A unilateral moratorium has been declared on the deployment of further medium-range nuclear devices in the European part of our country and the number of such devices is being reduced.

The USSR and the other Warsaw Pact countries are constructive in their approach to the formulation of mutually acceptable agreements on reducing armed forces and arms in central Europe. The socialist community states support the idea of creating nuclear-free zones in north Europe and the Balkans.

The dangers threatening peace are great but the scope for averting the threat of war is greater still. This scope must be fully exploited.

Saving Europe from a military conflagration is an urgent imperative. Peace-loving states and powerful social forces in a variety of countries are determined to stick to the trail blazed in Helsinki. By rebuffing the adventurist policy being pursued by aggressive imperialist circles, they will multiply their efforts to turn our continent into a zone of firm security and good-neighborliness.

Zhukov Article

PM021621 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jul 82 p 4

[Political observer Yuriy Zhukov article: "Fundamental Principles"]

[Text] As a result of the adventurist policy being pursued in international affairs by the U.S. ruling circles, tension is growing in the world and the arms race is escalating, threatening nuclear disaster. Pursuing its hegemonist policy and relying on the aggressive NATO bloc, Washington is seeking to upset the balance of forces that has taken shape in the world, particularly in Europe, in order to dictate its will to the peoples without hindrance. This policy of imperialism's most aggressive circles -- a policy dangerous to the cause of peace -- is countered by the firm and consistent policy of the Soviet Union and the other socialist community countries. It fully accords with the peoples' desire to live in peace and security.

The fundamental principles on which just and equitable interstate relations must be built to exist. They are recorded in the CSCE Final Act. Drawn up as a result of talks which lasted approximately 3 years, this document was signed in Helsinki on 1 August 1975 by the heads of 33 European states as well as the United States and Canada.

As Comrade L.I. Brezhnev pointed out before the signing of the Final Act, the results of the all-European conference represent not only a summing up of the necessary political outcome of World War II, but also an interpretation of the future. "The document which you are about to sign," he said, "while summing up the past, looks to the future in terms of its substance."

The sovereign equality of states, the non-use of force or the threat of force, inviolability of borders, the territorial integrity of states, the peaceful settlement of disputes, noninterference in each other's internal affairs, respect for human rights and basic freedom, equality of rights and the peoples' right to be master of their own destiny, cooperation among states and the conscientious fulfillment of commitments under international law -- these noble principles recorded in the declaration which opens the Final Act's first section devoted to questions relating to security in Europe have been perceived by the peoples as a law designed to regulate interstate relations.

The provisions included in the Final Act relating to cooperation in the economic, scientific, technical and environmental spheres are of just as tremendous and lasting significance as those devoted to cooperation in the humanitarian and other spheres.

A long road -- two decades! -- led up to that fruitful conference, the idea for which was advanced by the Soviet Union back in January 1954 and, in 1966, was developed and reinforced by an action program drawn up by all the European socialist countries belonging to the Warsaw Pact.

Recall the progress of that difficult process, whose soul, as the participants in the all-European conference subsequently acknowledged, was the Soviet Union, the Leninist Communist Party and its Central Committee headed by Comrade L.I. Brezhnev.

Treaties proclaiming the inviolability of the borders which had taken shape in Europe as a result of World War II had been drawn up, signed and validated between the USSR and the FRG, Poland and the FRG, the GDR and the FRG and Czechoslovakia and the FRG.

The very complex knot of the West Berlin problem, whose failure to settle had had Europe in a fever for more than two decades, had been untied.

The fundamental documents on interstate relations between the USSR and France and between the USSR and the United States, founded on the principle of peaceful coexistence among states with different political and social systems, had been drafted and signed.

A whole number of other very important multilateral and bilateral treaties and agreements aimed at limiting arms and reducing the danger of a new world conflict, including the Soviet-American agreement on the prevention of nuclear war, had been drawn up and concluded.

This was how the road to Helsinki -- to the table around which 35 heads of state sat together to sign the Final Act of the all-European conference -- was paved.

Many of the conference participants gave high assessments of its results at the time, considering it a substantial contribution to the cause of peace in Europe. But we also remember something else: literally the day after the results were released, the West's reactionary press opened fire on the Final Act with all their ink batteries.

We are not so naive as to think that those Western news media were acting on their own responsibility and at their own risk in launching sharp attacks on a document signed by the leaders of their states. As the subsequent development of events showed, the governments of the United States and some of its NATO allies, which had agreed to sign the Final Act under increasing pressure from the public in their countries, soon began acting contrary to the commitments they had adopted.

Already in March, 1978, President Ford publicly declared that in the future he would not even utter the word "detente." Presidents Carter and Reagan, turning U.S. policy increasingly sharply away from detente and toward confrontation, began renouncing accords reached earlier and generally behaving as though they were permitted any violation of any treaties whatever.

U.S. acts of tyranny, which are in flagrant contradiction with the accords reached in Helsinki, form a long chain. Its aggressive plans regard Europe merely as a possible theater of military operations. The talks on reducing arms and armed forces in Europe, as the Western press writes without constraint, are being used merely to placate the alarmed West Europeans. Economic ties with the USSR and other socialist countries are being crudely disrupted and broken off one after the other. Scientific and cultural ties are being curtailed, although at the time of the all-European conference, the U.S. representatives insisted -- hypocritically, as is now apparent -- on expanding them.

Now come the anecdotes. The State Department perceived a "Soviet threat" even in the showing of classic works of art belonging to the USSR at exhibitions in the United States.

Do you find this hard to believe, reader? But here is a concrete fact which I have borrowed from State Department Bulletin No 2036, page 52. An exhibition of treasures of the Hermitage, which had been 2 years in preparation, was to have opened in the United States on 15 May, 1980. And then the State Department banned the showing, claiming that it was "counter to U.S. national interests" (!).

By all accounts, the all-European accords reached in Helsinki in 1975 lie heavily on the present American administration. It is plainly seeking to resurrect the atmosphere of the cold war period by unceremoniously flouting all the accords reached at the all-European conference and returning to dangerous adventurist actions backed up by an accelerated arms race.

Protests against such a misguided political course fraught with grievous consequences for Western countries are growing increasingly louder not only in Europe, but in the United States itself. It is no coincidence, of course, that even such a conservative organ as the New York Council on Foreign Relations published a study entitled "Soviet-American Relations in the Eighties" which states that "American supremacy has retreated into the past."

The same study concludes from this that attempts to "build U.S. policy on the obvious or implied expectation that the USSR will change its political system" under pressure from the West represent a dangerous illusion, as "the Soviet Union became a global power in the seventies, and no good wishes can alter that fact."

Is it any wonder that the adventurist designs being proclaimed unconstrainedly by the Washington leaders are arousing ever-increasing indignation and alarm everywhere that the United States is trying to realize its hegemonist designs? The matter is not confined to stormy protests from increasingly broad popular masses. Even many leaders of states belonging to the North Atlantic military bloc are now rebuffing Reagan's dangerous policy.

Why? Because the principles of peaceful coexistence clearly and precisely formulated in the all-European conference Final Act accord with the fundamental interests of all European states without exception. This is why the U.S. NATO allies are increasingly frequently daring to say "No" to orders issuing from Washington which run counter to the principles proclaimed in Helsinki of relations among states, particularly in the economic sphere.

The Final Act contains a section entitled "Further Post-Conference Steps." In it, the 35 heads of state stated their determination to continue the multilateral process begun by them of strengthening security and developing cooperation in Europe and, to that end, to hold meetings among their representatives. The first such meeting was held in Belgrade in 1977, and the second began in Madrid back in 1980 but has still not been concluded and has now been suspended through the fault of the United States above all.

These meetings have not produced significant results because the U.S. representatives and some of their NATO allies are literally bending over backwards in their attempt to turn serious talks into a political farce being played out in an anti-Soviet spirit. They substitute for businesslike work demagoguery on topics which have no bearing on the elaboration of decisions which would help to further strengthen security in Europe and to expand mutually advantageous economic, scientific and cultural cooperation.

The Soviet Union invariably holds to the view that the all-European process should be continuous and should develop on a regular basis and in diverse forms. Many participants in the all-European conference also advocate this, as convincingly evidenced by the draft decisions prepared in Madrid by representatives of neutral and nonaligned countries which could serve as a basis for formulating the meeting's weighty final document. And, but for obstructionism on the part of the delegations from the United States and a number of its NATO allies, this document would have been adopted long ago and the all-European process would have entered on to a new stage of development.

Our country proceeds from the premise that to follow the Helsinki spirit means successfully concluding the Madrid meeting and crowning it with a decision to convene a conference on confidence-building measures and disarmament in Europe.

True to the Leninist policy of piece, the Soviet Union continues to consistently and persistently implement the peace program for the eighties elaborated by the 26th CPSU Congress, being firmly confident thatit accords with the vital interests of all mankind. The Soviet Union's adoption of a commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, as proclaimed in Comrade L.I. Brezhnev's message to the second UN General Assembly special session on disarmament, was an unprecedented act of good will. At the same session, the USSR submitted a memorandum containing specific proposals on all the major salients of modern international politics. A number of them have a direct bearing on the state of affairs on the European Continent.

Thus, the Soviet Union proceeds from the premise that it is necessary to totally rid our continent of both medium-range and tactical nuclear weapons. At the Soviet-American talks being held on this problem in Geneva, the USSR has advanced a number of important constructive initiatives with a view to making progress in limiting nuclear weapons and has backed them up with practical steps. Despite all the difficulties being erected by the American side which have come to light at the talks, it is essential to make progress there and to reach a mutually acceptable accord based on the principle of equality and identical security. Progress at the Vienna talks on the mutual reduction of armed forces and arms in Central Europe would also accord with the Helsinki spirit.

An important role in curtailing the nuclear arms race belongs to the formation of geographic zones where these weapons must neither be created nor deployed. As for Europe, this could apply to the north of the continent and to the Balkans.

The transformation of the Mediterranean into a zone of stable peace and cooperation would also signify an important step on the path opened up in Helsinki.

The Soviet Union has firmly and resolutely advocated and now advocates the consistent implementation of all 10 Helsinki principles, the strengthening of security and the development of cooperation in Europe and throughout the world.

CSCE Principles Remain Valid

PM040935 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 1 Aug 82 p 3

[E. Kovalev article: "Europe: 7 Years After Helsinki"]

[Excerpts] Now, when the European countries' peace-loving public is marking the seventh anniversary of the signing of the CSCE Final Act in Helsinki, it is important to recall that the principles of peaceful coexistence, good-neighborliness and mutually beneficial cooperation among Europe's peoples and states, which were enshrined in the Final Act and have become generally recognized norms of international law, still have the ability to exert a perceptible influence on the European Continent's life. They remain in force despite the course of confrontation with the socialist world adopted by the U.S. administration in recent years, the intensification of the arms race and the undermining of the foundations of European stability.

It is no chance that there has recently been a new and sharp exacerbation of relations between the industrially-developed West European countries and the United States, who has opposed Western European cooperation with the Soviet Union in carrying out this transcontinental project. Washington's attempts by flagrant diktat to impose on the allies a policy of "sanctions" against the socialist countries have been rightly evaluated in the West European capitals as undermining normal international trade and economic ties, as intolerable interference in the allies' affairs and an attempt on their sovereignty.

Many West European leaders are aware that the economic war in which Washington wants to embroil its allies is geared to undermining the foundations of detente which has brought the many benefits to the European Continent. FRG Chancellor H. Schmidt, speaking recently in Houston (United States), stated: "If I have repeatedly warned Europe against complicity by its conduct in a return to the cold war, this is by no means because I consider the potential of detente to be unlimited.... But I am convinced that, taking account of the tremendous nuclear arsenals of East and West, peace cannot be made firmer by confrontation." H. Schmidt demanded that U.S. officials show greater unity in Western economic policy. "There must be no trade war in relations with the East, either," the FRG chancellor noted.

Which way to go, therefore -- forward to the consolidation of detente and the development of cooperation in the mainstream of the Helsinki principles, or backward to political and economic cold war along the path of confrontation? Where to place the stakes -- on a self-determined [samostoyatelnyy] and independent [nezavisimyy] course in international affairs or on unconditional subordination to Washington's diktat? How to conduct foreign policy -- by a businesslike and constructive discussion of disputes or by strong pressure, threats and overt reliance on military force? What aim to pursue -- the development of mutually beneficial economic cooperation and the maintenance of stable military equilibrium in Europe or the undermining of all the material achievements of detente and the attainment of strategic superiority over the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Pact countries? The development of the situation on the European Continent, and not only Europe, depends greatly on how these questions are resolved.

Because the European countries' influence on the course of world events is truly enormous and the firmer peace is in Europe and the deeper mutual understanding is among the European countries, the greater the positive influence that they can exert on the stabilization of the situation throughout the world.

DEPUTY MINISTERS ON PIPELINE CONSTRUCTION

CEMA "Production-Sharing"

AU031443 Sofia OTECHESTVEN FRONT in Bulgarian 2 Aug 82 p 7

[Evgeniy Viktorov interview with Dzandar Takoeyev, USSR deputy minister of petroleum industry; specially dispatched through APN for the daily OTECHESTVEN FRONT -- date, place not given]

[Text] The production of various types of highly resistant pipes for the oil and gas industry will be drastically increased in the USSR in the near future. This is provided for in a special program for the development of ferrous metallurgy, which has begun to be implemented.

The dependency of the Soviet oil and gas industry on imports is not very significant at the present moment. Nearly all types of equipment being imported from the West are now either produced or about to be produced by our own industry.

Question: What is the impact of the new restrictions imposed by the Reagan administration on the delivery of equipment and tools to the Soviet Union on the plans for the further development of the most important Soviet economic branches?

Answer: I think similar actions will produce results contrary to those pursued by their initiators. For us, such actions will be an additional impetus to perfect and accelerate even more the speed in commissioning the production of the necessary equipment. The opportunities of the Soviet economy, the great scientific potential, the tremendous material and labor resources are making this task feasible. The production sharing with the CEMA member-countries is also an important factor in this respect.

Question: It seems that people in the West have not learned from the lessons of the past....

Answer: We should not forget the lessons of the past. Thus, for example, after the introduction of the notorious embargo on the delivery of large pipes for the USSR, which was imposed by the NATO bloc, our country developed its own large-scale production of such pipes.

The same is happening today. The commissioning of a plant in the Tartar region and the reorganization of a number of other enterprises have already greatly facilitated the Soviet import of electrically operated pumps. The restriction imposed by the United States on the deliveries of oil industry equipment to the Soviet Union has served as an impetus for the development of this production in our country.

There is no doubt that our country will be able to cope with the construction of pipelines by our own effort but, as in the past, we are ready to pursue cooperation in this respect. There is no point in renouncing the mutual advantage of international division of labor. The West now has the floor.

'Strictly on Schedule'

LD302158 Moscow TASS in English 2130 GMT 30 Jul 82

[Text] Moscow July 31 TASS -- The Soviet Union, which pursues a peaceful foreign policy, strives for widening and strengthening economic relations with foreign states. "The contract of the century," as the agreement on the joint construction of a gas pipeline from Siberia to Western Europe is described in the West, has become an outstanding achievement in that field.

This was pointed out in an interview with the newspaper SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA by Grigory Sudobin, USSR deputy minister of the construction of oil and gas industry enterprises.

Touching, in connection with the contract, upon the discriminatory measures taken by President Reagan, the deputy minister pointed out that notwithstanding the pressure of the American administration almost all European partners have reaffirmed their determination to abide by their commitments under the contracts. Thus, Sudobin stressed, the presidential sanctions will affect a relatively small part of the supplies. From among construction equipment the Soviet Union will not receive the pipe-layers it has ordered, and from among the equipment for the gas pipeline -- 25 megawatt gas pumping plants.

It is planned to compensate for all that with supplies of Soviet-made equipment. Presently the Soviet Union has started batch production of SWAMP rover Tyumen, which is not inferior in any respect to the same equipment manufactured by a foreign firm. The Soviet Union also produces pipe layers, whose output capacity is even greater than that of foreign types of pipe layers. The point is to increase the output of Soviet-made pipe layers, and the necessary measures with that aim in view have already been taken at Soviet mills.

Three 25-megawatt gas pumping plants have been recently tested in test benches. They correspond in all of their parameters to the equipment manufactured abroad.

The deputy minister also said that the "export section" makes less than a fifth of the all-union programme for the Eleventh Five-Year Plan period (1981-1985) for the construction of gas pipelines from West Siberia to the centre of the country. This country's industries supplying construction equipment and machinery for compressor stations are able to meet the whole demand. If necessary, it would be quite possible to do with the national resources, he stressed.

Speaking of the course of construction of the export gas pipeline, Sudobin said: "The length of the whole gas pipeline is 4,451 kilometres. A thousand kilometres of pipes have already been welded on racks. A half of them have already been taken to the construction site. A total of 328 kilometres of pipes have been welded into a single line. Every day the gas pipeline grows on an average by seven kilometres. We are strictly on schedule."

U.S., EEC 'STEEL WAR' NEGOTIATIONS VIEWED

LD031430 Moscow TASS in English 1230 GMT 3 Aug 82

[Text] Moscow August 3 TASS -- TASS news analyst Sergey Bogatov writes:

Negotiations are being started between the United States and the commission of the European communities with a view to establishing peace or if only truce in the so-called 'steel war.'

The gist of the problem, as is known, is in the fact that official Washington, obeying the demands of the U.S. steel companies, is threatening to impose additional duties on the import of West European steel. This is fraught with an inevitable reduction and even termination of the export of steel from EEC countries to across the ocean.

The West Europeans complain that that will seriously aggravate their problems and will lead to the growth of unemployment in EEC countries. They justly point out that such actions of the White House as the ban on the delivery of equipment, made in Western Europe to U.S. licences, to the USSR for the Siberia-Western Europe gas pipeline, and the hindrances to the export of steel to the USA entail serious consequences for international trade.

The steel case, spokesman of "the Ten" are stating, is an attempt at changing in the interests of one side -- the USA -- the general balance achieved within the framework of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. This is really so.

But there is one aspect which is being passed over in silence by EEC leaders and which would not be superfluous to mention.

"The participating states shall strive to reduce or gradually remove all kinds of obstacles to the development of trade; shall promote a steady growth of trade, avoiding as far as possible sharp fluctuations in their goods turnover." Whence are these words? From the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade? No, they are from the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe signed in Helsinki by the leaders of thirty-three European states and of the USA and Canada.

The leaders of "the Ten" for some reason do not allude to this document. Maybe, they are embarrassed by the words of the Final Act stipulating that trade should be maintained so that no serious damage is caused to domestic markets? But last year the export of European steel to the USA accounted for almost 6.6 percent of the U.S. market. So, there can be no question of any "serious damage" to the U.S. market.

One gathers the impression that some Western leaders prefer regarding the Final Act only as a point of departure for polemical attacks on socialist states, and are not ready to view it as a code of basic principles of relations of peace and cooperation between states.

In this connection, coming to mind are Leonid Brezhnev's words that the success of the European conference proved of benefit to everyone: The countries of the East and West, the peoples of socialist and capitalist states -- the members of alliances and neutral ones, big and small. Yes, that was of common benefit and it would be very well if all state figures of the West in their practical activities are guided by the final document of the historic Helsinki forum.

'OBSOLETE' U.S. VIEW OF TIES WITH WEST EUROPE

LD031304 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 3 Aug 82

[Text] What is the reaon for the current sharp worsening of relations between the United States and its Western partners? Why has the U.S. administration failed to prevent an erosion of these relations? These questions are dealt with in the following comment by our news analyst Igor Aleksandrov. Here is what he writes:

As I see it, the whole point is that the White House is guided by obsolete views which some U.S. policymakers formed soon after the end of World War II and that are totally unsuitable today. At that time, three decades ago, Western Europe lay in ruins and for the sake of U.S. aid its rulers were ready to give up national sovereignty. But since then the situation has changed. Today for its economic and scientific potential Western Europe is on a par with the United States in many areas. In present day conditions it is quite wrong, it is political blindness, to look at Western Europe through the glasses of the past the way the White House is doing. This is equal to running up and down rocks blindfolded.

As the White House announced the ban on deliveries of equipment for the Siberian gas pipeline, equipment manufactured in West European countries on U.S. lisences, it did not expect at all that this measure would produce such a storm of protests, and these have not just been public protests but protests by prime ministers and heads of state. President Mitterrand of France, West German Chancellor Schmidt, the Italian Prime Minister Spadolini and the British Premier Mrs Thatcher have all denounced the one-sided actions by the White House.

Never before have America's partners in the Atlantic alliance acted so unanimously, so categorically and so sharply against attempts by the White House to dictate to them. The West Europeans are up in arms against the White House methods of diplomacy as well as against the essence of its policy. French President Mitterrand has said it was unfortunate that the U.S. administration was trying to have us accept a monologue, or in other words, it resorts to a policy of dictating.

The Washington leaders still refuse to take into account the interests of their allies, who desperately need supplies of Soviet gas just as they need maintenance and development of trade and economic cooperation with the Soviet Union. The White House has set itself the goal of ruining the Siberian gas pipeline project at any cost and to prevent the signing of any contracts. That is viewed in the West European capitals as an ill-considered and harmful action and for this reason no one has agreed to join it.

On Monday, the British trade secretary, Lord Cockfield, called President Reagan's sanctions an attempt to interfere with existing contracts and an unacceptable extension of U.S. extraterritorial jurisdiction in a way which is repugnant in international law.

One must also consider the fact that in general many Western European statesmen treasure easing tensions and mutually advantageous relations between East and West and so there is a mounting protest movement in the West European countries against the White House plans to use them not only in American's economic plans but also in its military calculations as an advanced theater of war; and so there is every reason to draw the conclusions that an absence of realism, an adventuristic stake on nuclear war and shortsightedness are the aspects of the White House policy that have brought about a sharp worsening of relations between the United States and Western Europe. This process is bound to develop unless the U.S. leaders give up their bellicose line, their policy of dictating.

## PRAVDA REPORTS ON REAGAN PRESS CONFERENCE, POLL

PM021515 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jul 82 p 5

[TASS report: "Reagan Press Conference"]

[Text] Washington, 29 Jul -- The U.S. President has held a routine press conference. To a considerable extent it was devoted to the U.S. economic situation and the administration's actions in this field. Answering questions, Reagan admitted that the U.S. economy "is on its knees" and that "the rapidly growing inflation, high bank rates and high taxes over many years have deprived people of their incomes and weakened each family's ability to pay its bills and save for the future." The country, he said, is experiencing "economic troubles" and many Americans are "suffering" and "feel trapped."

One journalist, after these "revelations" by the President, asked whether "Reagan is preparing the ground for more bad news" and how much longer, "weeks, months or years, the Americans must wait" before the widely billed "Reaganomics" program "begins to bear fruit." In reply, the President mentioned the "errors" of the past and the fact that "in the past 20 years we have had 19 budget deficits" and essentially was unable to give any encouragement.

Reagan expressed himself in support of the constitutional amendment on the compulsory balancing out of Federal budgets although, as is well known, it is precisely as a result of his policy and, above all, the hiking of military expenditures that these deficits have reached a record level and, in the next 3 years, according to a forecast published by congressional budget office director A. Rivlin, will apparently total $140-160 billion instead of $100 billion as previously stated by the Reagan administration.

Ordinary Americans' keen dissatisfaction with the administration's economic course is borne out by the figures of a public opinion poll just published by Gallup. It emerges that the overwhelming majority of the U.S. population -- 81 percent -- is dissatisfied with Washington's measures to combat unemployment.

Some 44 percent of those polled also sharply denounce Washington's foreign policy course.

## U.S. ARMS SALES ABROAD IMPLEMENT FOREIGN POLICY

### Military Exports

LD031420 Moscow TASS in English 1320 GMT 3 Aug 82

["The United States Is the Biggest Supplier of Arms" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow August 3 TASS -- The export of arms holds a special place in the U.S. plans of attaining global and regional superiority, of expanding and consolidating its military presence. Relevant data is contained in the booklet "Whence the Threat to Peace." Its second supplemented edition has come off the press.

During the past ten years the volume of U.S. military export increased more than four-fold and amounted in 1980 to 17.5 billion dollars, the authors of the book stress. The flow of arms has particularly grown to the Near and Middle East and to Western Europe. The main recipients of American military hardware in the 1970's were Saudi Arabia (which during the past decade bought in the United States military products to the sum of 35 billion dollars); Iran (14 billion dollars); Israel (11 billion dollars); Britain, the FRG and South Korea (5 billion dollars each); Egypt, Holland, Taiwan and Japan (3 billion dollars each).

The share of the United States in world deliveries of arms and military equipment amounts to 45 percent and of other NATO countries to more than 20 per cent.

The increased sales of modern weaponry -- F-14, F-15 and F-16 combat aircraft, Lance theater missiles, missile frigates of the Perry class and tanks -- is a specific feature of the military export of the United States. Late in the 1980's the U.S. Department of Defence alone had export orders to the sum of about 56 billion dollars providing for the delivery of almost a thousand planes and helicopters, 150 ships and auxiliary vessels, 1,100 tanks 4,200 armoured personnel carriers, 1,500 field artillery pieces, 110,000 rockets of various types and large quantities of other military hardware. These armaments are intended not only for beefing up the military might of recipient countries but also for possible use by the United States itself, first of all the Rapid Deployment Force.

Arms deliveries are usually made dependent on political terms. Thus, the then secretary of state of the United States, Alexander Haig, told the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives on November 12, 1981, that the administration intended to expand military aid and step up strategic cooperation only with those countries that gave the United States assistance in the attainment of its aims.

'Conventional Weapons' Report

LD031136 Moscow TASS in English 0918 GMT 3 Aug 82

[Text] Washington August 3 TASS -- The U.S. Department of State has issued a report entitled "The Transfer of Conventional Weapons to Third-World Countries in the Period of 1982-1983." Over the period the United States concluded agreements to deliver armaments and military equipment (including military construction) to the developing countries to an aggregate of 83,414 million dollars.

Regimes "friendly" to Washington, such as Israel, as well as military-repressive dictatorships in Latin America accounted first of all for a lion's share of the deliveries. The regimes, which the United States overtly uses for the pursuance of its aggressive imperial policy in various regions of the world, were supplied with more than 46,000 various systems of modern U.S. armaments, including 22,000 tanks and other armoured cars, more than 8,220 artillery guns, more than 320 warships and 20 submarines, 6,710 combat aircraft and helicopters, and 8,890 surface-to-air missiles.

State Department Counsellor James Buckley frankly admits in the preface to the report the USA regards the deliveries of weapons as a lawful and necessary instrument of foreign policy.

Further on Report

LD031926 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 3 Aug 82

[From "The World Today" program presented by political observer Eduard Mnatsakanov]

[Text] The U.S. State Department has published a special report on U.S. arms sales to Third World countries. The report says that in the last 9 years the United States supplied developing countries weapons worth the astronomical total of $83,414,000,000. It is reported that these countries have been sold 22,000 American tanks, over 320 ships, 6,710 combat aircraft and helicopters and about 9,000 missiles. Must of these supplies went to regimes friendly to Washington, such as Israel, Pakistan, Somalia, South Korea and military fascist dictatorships in Latin America.

Contrast With USSR Policy

LD032308 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2217 GMT 3 Aug 82

["Who Is Imposing the Arms Race?" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 4 Aug (TASS) -- TASS observer Ivan Ablamov writes:

The Reagan administration has put lies on the production line. In the bowels of the Washington departments one falsehood after another is being engendered.

The latest piece of knavery was the report by the U.S. State Department about deliveries of arms to the developing countries in the period 1972-1981. Tha authors embark upon all sorts of contrivances in order to try to absolve the United States of responsibility for imposing the arms race on the developing countries, for kindling hotbeds of tension reaching as far as armed conflicts in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

As is known, with the arrival of the present administration in power a sharply increasing stream of American arms has been flowing -- mainly to pro-American, military-dictatorial, fascistic regimes. However, the report of the State Department in essence excludes part of these loyal clients of the United States from the list of "the Third World" with one aim -- to distort the real picture, to present matters as if the Soviet Union were supplying more weapons to these areas than the United States, and therefore, so they say, is guilty of enflaming tension.

The Soviet Union does not hide the fact that it supplies arms to those who are fighting for the just cause of national liberation and strengthening national security, considering this to be their sacred duty, but not for aggression; it is for the necessary defense of peace-loving developing states from the danger of imperialist intervention and aggressive actions by its henchmen. Soviet arms are successful, as shown by the recent events in the Near East; they serve the cause of the freedom of peoples.

The United States is quite another matter: It has for long been the biggest arms trader in the world. It is imposing upon the developing countries the monstrous burden of militarization, taking away enormous amounts of money from the struggle against economic backwardness, hunger and poverty.

In the 1970's the United States supplied about half the weapons acquired by the developing countries. It is thought that this year alone the amount of American military exports will reach $30 billion, with an enormous share of this going to developing countries.

At the end of 1980 the Pentagon alone had export orders worth $56 billion. American weapons, as is shown by incontrovertible facts, serve aggression, interference in the internal affairs of sovereign states, the suppression of the national liberation movement. Almost 4/5 of all arms being exported by Washington go to countries of the Near and Middle East, primarily to Israel. It is precisely the United States which has armed to the teeth the Israeli military, who have started a bloody massacre in Lebanon. American supplies of weapons are turning the Near East into an increasingly dangerous hotbed of international tension.

It was American arms which started the massive carnage in El Salvador. American arms are being used in provocations against the peoples of Nicaragua, Angola, Mozambique and Kampuchea. American military supplies to Pakistan are destabilizing the situation in that area.

One cannot help noticing the fact that if aggressors such as the Israeli criminals are being supplied with modern weapons by the United States, then it is supplying many other countries with out-of-date arms, leaving them helpless in the face of imperialist aggression. Thus over half the American bombs supplied to the Argentine Air Force were unsuited for the struggle against the British Navy during the Falkland crisis -- to put it simply, they did not explode. Even in the view of Pentagon specialists, if American arms had been more reliable, the outcome of the military actions between Britain and Argentina might have been different.

The U.S. line of imposing the arms race on the developing countries is counterposed by the Soviet Union's course aimed at disarmament and the utilization of the funds thus made free to serve the needs of development. Its numerous peace initiatives are directed at this.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA EVALUATES U.S. 'STEALTH' TECHNOLOGY

PM031331 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Jul 82 p 3

[Candidate of Technical Sciences Col Yu. Alekseyev "Military-Technical Review": "'Invisible' Aircraft"]

[Text] The summer of 1980 saw the presentation in Washington of a new work from the American military-industrial complex, the Stealth intercontinental strategic bomber. The then Pentagon chief himself, Harold Brown, supplied the information on the development of this aircraft at a press conference. Why was such attention given to the U.S. Air Force's new brainchild? The answer lies in the essence of the very name, Stealth, which is taken from the English world "stealthy," or, in technical jargon, hard to detect.

Nor was the time chosen to supply the "information" fortuitous. The U.S. election campaign was entering its final phase, and President Carter's supporters hoped that the Stealth bomber would prove a trump card in the struggle against Reagan, particularly as in 1977 Carter had halted the series production of the B-1 strategic bomber.

Following the official publication of the Stealth project, the Western press -- primarily the American press -- poured a flood of commentaries into its publications as though on command. Speaking about the new-technology aircraft, ARMY TIMES commentators emphasized that Soviet radar stations would be virtually incapable of detecting it. It was hinted that the United States had a powerful new stick, and you can imagine what that means, it was said.

This was not the first case of blackmail against the Soviet Union. Let us recall how in 1945, at the Potsdam conference, Truman told Stalin that the United States possessed a weapon of monstrous destructive force. However, nothing came of the attempt at nuclear blackmail. Subsequent similar actions were also unsuccessful. And now -- the Stealth bomber.

The political coloration of this Pentagon venture is visible to the naked eye, as the saying goes. Former Defense Secretary Brown did not even deem it necessary to conceal it and declared at the press conference that the Stealth aircraft would be "a reliable means of maintaining peace." And the CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR summed it up: "The invisible aircraft has good political visibility." Something else is significant, too. The first mentions of Stealth aircraft in the American press date back to 1978, but nothing much was made of it until August 1980.

Of course, the novelty being extolled by the Western press, which supposedly is claimed to be the absolute weapon, has real scientific and technical basis. The Stealth aircraft (the Western press also calls this type of bomber an ATB -- advanced technology bomber) is not some unique discovery. Rather, it is the comprehensive utilization of a number of scientific and technical achievements in one project. The crux of the matter was to create a machine difficult for radar facilities to detect (compared with aircraft of the preceding generation).

As the magazine ARMADA testifies, the U.S. Air Force began work on the Stealth program in the early seventies and channeled it in the following directions: the choice of the aircraft's special configuration and silhouette; the creation of radio-absorbing coatings and materials that disperse reflected radar signals (composition materials, ceramics and others); the development of electronic apparatus with a principle of operation based on real time analysis of the irradiating action of radar stations and on the generation of false relfected signals (misinformation about range and speed); and, finally, the reduction of noise levels.

In the opinion of specialists working for foreign firms, certain indirect measures could also help to realize the concept of the "invisible" aircraft. Thus, Ferranti believes that it will be useful to equip an attacking aircraft with a display indicating the atmosphere's penetrability for microwave frequencies. Such an instrument would enable the pilot to select the cruising altitude at which the conditions are worst for the dissemination of radio waves in that band. This is equivalent to the shortest range of the aircraft's detection by the corresponding enemy radar facilities.

To reduce the likelihood of the "invisible" aircraft's detection it is proposed, in addition, to restrict or stop the working of electronic radiating facilities in those bands where the penetrability of their frequencies is best. Foreign specialists believe that existing onboard computers will be able to ensure the resolution of that task. Means of depicting in altitude-range coordinates a zone in which an airborne aircraft could be detected by the enemy are being examined as a possible alternative display.

According to Ferranti, natural high-altitude radio-conductive channels occur in the atmosphere in the middle geographic latitudes (30-45 degrees), particularly over the Mediterranean and in the Near East.

The acute competitive struggle among American airplane manufacturers for the "rich new strategic cake" ended with California's Northrop becoming the chief developer of the Stealth bomber, and Boeing and General Electric becoming subcontractors (for the power unit). An aircraft of the "flying wing" type is being considered as a possible project, with air intakes sunk into the leading edge of the surfaces, active control of aerodynamic forces and two laser installations (in the nose and the tail) for self-defense purposes.

The bigwigs of the U.S. military-industrial complex spare no expense to create "prestigious," in their opinion, means of air attack. Thus the magazine ELECTRONICS testifies that the annual expenditure on developing Stealth technology amounts to as much as $100 million. Western commentators estimate the cost of the whole project at $9-10 billion, and the U.S. Air Force's needs at 100-110 aircraft.

The Reagan administration is generously satisfying the so-inordinately-inflated appetite of the Pentagon, which in turn does not wish to remain in debt to Uncle Sam and is promising to start the series construction of Stealth bombers in 1988 or 1989. It is planned to produce the first aircraft by 1991. In order to meet these deadlines Northrop plans to start flight tests of an experimental model in 1984.

Seeking to further build up the already inflated military program for the rearmament of its Air Force, the Pentagon intends as soon as possible to embody the ideas of the "invisible" aircraft in combat models of weapons. According to the magazine ARMADA, to this same end Lockheed is developing a fighter employing this technology, different versions of which the U.S. Air Force intends to use to overcome air defenses, to carry out reconnaissance and for direct air support.

An experimental version of the fighter (having a similar configuration to the F-18 aircraft, a delta wing, dorsal air intakes and shielded nozzles) has been created at the "skunk" plant in the San Fernando Valley. Flight trials are currently being conducted on three experimental models of this aircraft. It is supposed that the series-production fighter will be considerably larger, but small enough to be conveyed by C-5 military transports to any point in the world. Other American firms, in particular Grumman, are also developing similar fighters.

In creating the new "technical stick" American strategists originally voiced no doubts as to its exclusiveness. However, when the hullabaloo subsided somewhat, sober voices also began to be heard.

Thus, Lieutenant General Burke, assistant chief of Air Force staff, declared that the use of Stealth technology in the B-1B bomber (this idea, too, has gained currency) is designed to ensure that it is difficult for Soviet ground radar facilities to detach it. But the task is made considerably easier, he said, if low-flying strategic bombers are observed and intercepted with the help of interceptor-fighters equipped with lookdown radar facilities.

The history of the development of means of armed struggle shows that never has a single model of an absolute weapon been created. Those who forget the laws of dialectics must understand that, however destructive a weapon (nuclear or otherwise) may be, this does not rule out the possibility of creating means of combating it. Under these conditions, there can be no question of any absoluteness. Neither millions nor trillions of dollars will guarantee it.

U.S. TO EXPAND VOA 'PSYCHOLOGICAL WAR' ON USSR

LD032004 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0955 GMT 3 Aug 82

[Text] Washington, 3 Aug (TASS) -- Expanding the frantic psychological war against the socialist and developing states, the Reagan administration is stepping up the potential of one of its main weapons in that war -- the subversive Voice of America radio station.

As the Washington POST reports, the ICA, of which the Voice of America is a part, recently sent the White House a confidential document in which it demanded the immediate allocation of about $300 million for "modernization" of the station's equipment. In particular, it calls for the acquiring of new sites in various parts of the world to install powerful new transmitters which would make it possible to expand the amount of broadcasting from this slanderous Washington mouthpiece.

There is no doubt that the ICA will get all the funds it needs to expand its subversive activity. Only 2 weeks ago, President Reagan himself announced the administration's plans to modernize Voice of America's equipment with the aim of stepping up ideological diversion against the countries of the socialist community and the developing states.

The fact that the sharp edge of Washington's psychological war is aimed at those countries is also evidenced by the portion of the ICA document which delineates certain measures planned for the technical reequipment of Voice of America. Thus, according to the Washington POST, it is planned to build a transmitter on Grand Cayman Island in the Caribbean from where hostile radio propaganda will be waged against Cuba, Nicaragua and a whole range of Central American countries. It is also planned to build several transmitters in Sri Lanka.

The powerful radio transmitters in Tangiers and Munich, which send out a copious flow of lies and slanders against the USSR and countries of Asia and Africa, will be subject to considerable revamping.

ARABIC SERVICE ON PRC COOPERATION WITH ISRAEL

LD031950 Moscow in Arabic to the Arab World 1500 GMT 3 Aug 82

[Text] Waves of American tourists are arriving in Beijing. The Washington POST reported that about 40,000 tourists from the United States visited China in 1 year, but not all of them were American citizens. Representatives of the Israeli military and various types of experts and consultants visit Beijing as tourists by way of the United States. This form of relations with Israel suits Beijing, which tries by all possible means to conceal these relations from the Arab countries. On the other hand, this also suits Israel. It is known that (?thousands) of Israeli experts, engineers, technicians and others receive training at American military plants such as [word indistinct] Lockheed, Grumman and others. Zionist capital finances their education and travel to China.

In January, 1980, a secret meeting was held in Washington between the representatives of China and Israel at the initiative of the American military-industrial complex. The meeting discussed the development of relations between the PRC and Israel, primarily in the military field. China expressed interest in buying weapons and electronic equipment manufactured by Israel.

The Israeli military industry is a branch of the American military-industrial complex. Israel does not have the strategic minerals necessary for the production of many types of military equipment. Therefore, the Israeli Zionists are showing increasing interest in obtaining strategic materials from China. To this end, (?active security) measures (?were taken).

Radio Israel has reported that many Israeli technicians and engineers are in Beijing to participate in the implementation of a big industrial project for the extraction of natural resources. According to the Israeli paper HA'ARETZ, (Saul Eisenberg), an American capitalist, has played an intermediary role in the widening of economic relations between China and Israel. [Words indistinct] (Eisenberg) represents the Zionist capital in the Far East, including Singapore. [Passage indistinct]

The racist quarters in Pretoria actively support this cooperation. South Africa provides uranium to China and Israel. This was disclosed by the American journalists [names indistinct]. The facts about the widening economic and military relations between China and Israel expose the Beijing hegemonists, who claim that they struggle in defense of the rights of the Arab peoples against Zionist aggression. It is very clear that the United States and Israel would not have given weapons and loans to Beijing had China risen up against Israel and Zionism. But Beijing struggles against the Zionist Israelis only in words, and in reality pursues a policy (?hostile) to the Arabs and supportive of U.S. imperialism and cooperation with the Israeli aggressor.

BREZHNEV, MALDIVES PRESIDENT EXCHANGE TELEGRAMS

LD031728 Moscow TASS in English 1620 GMT 3 Aug 82

[Text] Moscow August 3 TASS -- Leonid Brezhnev has addressed a telegram to President Maumoon Abdul Gayoom of the Republic of Maldives extending to him and the friendly people of the Maldives congratulations and the best wishes on the occasion of the national holiday -- the independence day.

In his reply telegram Maumoon Abdul Gayoom expressed gratitude for the congratulations and on his part extended to Leonid Brezhnev the best wishes of good health and happiness.

PAKISTANI POLICIES SEEN DISRUPTING WORLD PEACE

GF031547 Tashkent International Service in Uzbek 1700 GMT 2 Aug 82

[Unattributed commentary: "Pakistan, (?A Center of Aggression"]

[Summary] The Islamabad administration pretends to favor the settlement of the situation around the DRA through political talks. In fact, this administration has moved to express a readiness for serious negotiations with DRA representatives. However, the actual deeds of the Islamabad administration have indicated that they are not prepared to hold talks on the matter. "The officials of Pakistan are acting in a way which constitutes interference in the internal affairs of independent Afghanistan. The Pakistan administration is organizing armed interference in the interal affairs of independent Afghanistan. The consolidation of such interference is being realized through the actual participation of Pakistani officials. The Indian daily, the NATIONAL HERALD, recently wrote: Pakistan is participating in the counterrevolutionary movement against Afghanistan. Under the circumstances, is it possible to create the atmosphere necessary for holding talks?"

Pakistan has been turned into a center of support for the undeclared war on Afghanistan. "The headquarters of Afghan counterrevolutionaries has been set up in Pakistan. Apart from this, about 80 centers and military fortifications for secessionists have been established in Pakistan. Thousands of terrorists and counterrevolutionary rebels are being trained in military fortifications and centers under Beijing and Pakistan experts. Once their training is completed, they are sent into Afghanistan. The bands of robbers, who are trained in these (?counterrevolutionary) centers and supplied with arms, are advised to destroy the gains of the 1978 revolution in the Afghan homeland."

Islamabad is extending every kind of aid to the counterrevolutionary groups. "Meanwhile, the Islamabad administration if being pressed to agree to the formation of an Afghan government in exile from among the members of the Afghan counterrevolutionary groups. All this is indicative of the fact that Pakistan wishes to further (?worsen) the situation around Afghanistan in the future and (?maintain) tension in the region. Meanwhile, Washington, heeding views put forward by Pakistan, which is the most [word indistinct] regarding war, (?seems in favor of militarizing that country which seeks a military settlement)."

The Islamabad administration's policy aimed at militarizing the country is giving an opportunity to its patrons, Washington and Beijing, to extend military and economic aid to Pakistan. All this is leading Pakistan to adopt a negative stance in the region. "The officials in Pakistan are pursuing a hostile policy toward India, Pakistan's neighbor. The Indian press is reporting on a daily basis the (?attacks) of Pakistan's military officials. [sentence indistinct] Meanwhile, Islamabad's military preparations on Pakistan's border with India are common knowledge. It has been reported that Pakistan currently has nearly 250,000 troops deployed on its borders with India. Heavy military equipment, including rocket-launchers, is also deployed. Under the circumstances, Delhi is justified in expressing anxiety over the 21 percent increase in Pakistan's military (?budget) during the current fiscal year.

Pakistan's military moves on the basis of U.S. and PRC aid are being linked with Pakistan's claim over certain border regions in India. It is possible for the people of India to [word indistinct] Pakistan's military activities against their homeland. They are, therefore, being forced to take certain steps to maintain (?the security of their borders)."

Officials in the Islamabad administration must realize that their policy is not only disrupting tranquility in the region but also endangering world peace.

PRESS PHOTO SHOWS USSR TROOPS IN AFGHANISTAN

PM031057 [Editorial Report] Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian on 10 July prints on page 2 a photograph taken "on Afghan territory." According to the caption it shows six soldiers from a motorized rifle subunit which forms part of the "limited Soviet military contingent in Afghanistan." The caption states that the subunit is commanded by "Communist Guards Senior Lieutenant Nabi Akramov, graduate of the Marshal of the Soviet Union I.S. Konev officers training school in Alma-Ata and holder of the Order of the Red Star." The caption also lists the names of the soldiers in the photograph: "Guards Sr Lt N. Akramov with leading soldiers of the company, Guards Jr Sgt A. Volkov, Guards Sgt N. Kichko and Guards Privates A. Amanov, G. Guliyev and K. Aytchanov."

SIHANOUK'S COALITION PART OF PRC STRATEGY

PM031147 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Jul 82 Morning Edition p 5

[Article by V. Ganshin: "The Deception Will Not Work"]

[Text] For nearly a month, former Prince Sihanouk, "president" of the "Coalition Government of Democratic Kampuchea," has been touring cities and villages, appearing at press conference after press conference in an attempt to persuade public opinion to support his bid for power in the People's Republic of Kampuchea (PRK). Immediately after the formation of the puppet "cabinet" in Kuala Lumpur, he paid a visit to Thailand, where he went on about the "coalition's" aims and tasks, passionately calling for all kinds of assistance, primarily financial and military. Naturally, Sihanouk very soon turned up in Beijing since China is the chief inspiration behind and main provider for the reactionary forces in Southeast Asia which still have hopes of overthrowing the legitimate Government of People's Kampuchea.

Beijing propaganda gave wide coverage to Sihanouk's visit to the Chinese capital. The intentionally grand reception and the ballyhoo over the arrival of the ex-prince, now newly-made "president," obviously has a specific purpose. It is to give the impression that the show put on by the Chinese authorities features the real "representative" of a "government," support for whom, Deng Xiaoping said during a meeting with Sihanouk, is not a temporart act or "tactical step." It is clear, however, that Sihanouk is only representing mercenaries maintained by the U.S. and Beijing special services and Pol Pot thugs who were expelled from Kampuchea and are guilty of genocide against the country's people. Moreover, the current visit is taking place in a situation where the idea of the peaceful settlement of disputes is winning more and more support in the Southeast Asian countries. In this connection the PRC mass information media are trying to discredit and devalue in the republic's eyes the Indochinese countries' peace-loving course and thwart their efforts to normalize the situation in Southeast Asia.

As is known, the sixth conference of Indochinese countries' foreign ministers was held in Ho Chi Minh City on 6-7 July. The communique on the results of the talks between representatives of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam (SRV), Lao People's Democratic Republic (LPDR) and the PRK contains a number of fundamental new initiatives which represent a real basis for the solution of regional problems. Suffice it to mention, for example, the proposals on holding a constructive dialogue between Southeast Asian states and the elimination of tension on the Kampuchean-Thai border. Displaying good will, Vietnam and Kampuchea adopted a decision and embarked on the implementation of the withdrawal of part of the Vietnamese force from Kampuchean territory. Developing the well-known 1980 PRK proposals to Thailand, the conference also advocated the creation of a demilitarized zone on both sides of the Kampuchean-Thai border or of security zones free of any armed forces except those of Thailand and Kampuchea.

However, Beijing contrived to distort the Indochinese countries' peace initiatives out of all recognition, calling, for example, the proposal on eliminating tension on the Kampuchean-Thai border "interference in Thailand's internal affairs" and a "threat to its security and sovereignty"! By turning the facts upside down Beijing propaganda is hoping to shrug off the responsibility for preserving a dangerous seat of instability in that part of the world. It is China, the United States and the reactionary forces of Southeast Asia who are aiding the gangs of thugs who have their headquarters on Thai territory and are making sorties against a sovereign state -- the PRK. It is they who are trying to use representatives of local ethnic minorities and Huaqiao for their own selfish ends, in order to hinder peaceful building in Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea.

The same goal is pursued by the Beijing-inspired setting up of the "coalition government" with whose help, it was noted at the conference in Ho Chi Minh City, "the reactionary Beijing leadership, ASEAN and U.S. imperialism are trying to prettify the Pol Pot butchers, who are guilty of the crime of genocide, and to keep interfering in the PRK's internal affairs and to fuel tension in Southeast Asia."

In an attempt to normalize relations with states in the region and elaborate mutually acceptable solutions to complex issues at the negotiating table, which, in the opinion of the SRV, the LPDR and the PRK, would meet the national interests of every one of the countries and peoples of Southeast Asia, the governments of the Indochinese countries are working indefatigably in that direction. This purpose is also served by the current tour of a number of the region's states by SRV Foreign Minister Nguyen Co Thach. On the eve of his talks the Asian press noted that to establish peace and security in Southeast Asia the ASEAN leaders must adopt a statesmanlike approach to talks with the head of the SRV foreign policy department. A realistic assessment of the events of recent years in the region, many politicians and public figures in the Southeast Asian countries believe, will inevitably lead to the conclusion that the processes taking place in the Indochinese countries is irreversible. Only by acknowledging this as a basis for talks can the problems that have built up be solved really constructively.

It is these sober assessments as well as the growing international approval of the Indochinese countries' enterprising, peace-loving policy which trouble Beijing, Washington and their puppets from the "coalition government." A change for the better in the region's political climate would nullify their efforts to maintain a smouldering hotbed of tension there and would hinder their aggressive sorties against the SRV, the LPDR and the PRK.

China and the United States are doing their utmost to portray the formation of the "coalition government" as a "historic step" on the path to the solution of regional problems. However, considering their strategic aims in Southeast Asia, it is clear what peace-threatening developments could take place in the region. Under cover of "international recognition" of the puppet "cabinet," Beijing not only hopes to use it to further implement its own expansionist policy but hopes to keep a UN seat for the Pol Pot butchers and to involve the ASEAN countries in a dangerous confrontation with the Indochinese states. Beijing, whose least concern is normalization of the situation in Southeast Asia, is looking for more ways of pressuring the ASEAN countries and is trying to make them obedient tools in the implementation of its hegemonist plans. By giving Sihanouk the leading role, the Chinese capital is trying to deceive public opinion and make the peoples forget about the crimes committed by the Maoists' henchmen on Khmer land when they held sway. Just as they have been "forgotten" by "President" Sihanouk, who more than once in the past condemned the misanthropic Pol Pot regime to which he, not to mention many members of his family killed by bloody obscurantists, fell victim.

## IZVESTIYA REPORTS ON KAMPUCHEA'S RECOVERY

PM290903 [Editorial Report] Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian on 21 July Morning Edition carries on page 5 a 1,800-word dispatch, under the rubric "Reporting Kampuchea" and the title "On the Banks of the Mekong," by correspondent B. Vinogradov on Kampuchea's continuing efforts to remedy economic and social disruption inherited from the Pol Pot era. Citing a conversation held at the Kampuchean Ministry of Planning, the author notes that production in every sphere is expected to increase this year and goes on to dwell on the problems of the power industry, handicapped by having to use equipment allowed to fall into serious disrepair or even sabotaged by Pol Pot zealots. The role of practical assistance from the Soviet Union and other socialist countries in facilitating economic recovery is stressed. The article concludes by reiterating Kampuchean and Soviet views on how to normalize the political climate in Southeast Asia.

IZVESTIYA INTERVIEWS BULGARIAN FOREIGN MINISTER

LD031812 Moscow TASS in English 1731 GMT 3 Aug 82

[Text] Moscow August 3 TASS -- "The main goal of the USA in pursuit of its positions of strength policy is to ensure its military superiority over the countries of the socialist community. I wish to note at once that this policy is absolutely prospectless. The countries of the socialist community will never permit a change in the balance of forces," said Petr Mladenov, member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party, Bulgarian foreign minister. In an interview published in the newspaper IZVESTIYA today, he stressed that "without the military, political and economic aid rendered by imperialism, above all U.S. imperialism, to Israel, the impudent Israeli aggression against Lebanon, the barbaric genocide against the Lebanese people and the Arab people of Palestine would be impossible. We are faced with a classical case of a collusion of the forces of reaction against the peoples striving for free and independent life."

Touching upon the effect of Washington's "sanctions" spearheaded against the USSR, the minister said: "It is most clearly seen from the answer of the Soviet working class to put the gas pipeline into service on schedule. This is a worthy class answer of all those who are trying to create obstacles for the Soviet land. It is a demonstration of the USSR's economic and moral-political might. Such an answer is a cause for serious reflection in Washington and a number of West European capitals."

U.S. VIEW OF 'IMPROVEMENTS' IN POLAND NOTED

LD040248 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 3 Aug 82

[Vladimir Pozner commentary]

[Excerpts] Ladies and gentlemen, I want to make a statement. Here it is. Things in Poland are not as bad as you have been made to think. In fact, things are looking better every day. That's it. What? I hear no applause. Well, yes, I suppose some of you are shrugging your shoulders and saying to yourselves, That's just Radio Moscow propaganda, but don't jump to conclusions. You see Radio Moscow has nothing to do with that statement. I'll have to admit that Radio Moscow has been saying that the situation in Poland is looking up and that gradually the tensions are easing and would ease a whole lot faster if the West, particularly the United States, would stop interfering. But the statement I opened this talk with was not a Radio Moscow original. You know who made it? Just hold on to your chairs. President Ronald Reagan. Yes, ladies and gentlemen, according to a Voice of America broadcast, and the VOA is an official U.S. Government institution, the President of the United States made that statement when addressing the farmers' association in the State of Iowa. But he said more than that. He said that considering the improvement of the situation in Poland, he might consider calling off sanctions against Poland and the USSR.

At this point, the Poles and 270 million Soviets are supposed to go wild with joy and come pouring out into the streets of our cities singing Ronnie took the sanctions off to the tune of Yankee Doodle Dandy. Seriously though, what really happened? When Reagan called the sanctions just recently he said things in Poland were not only unimproved but getting worse. They could not have changed that quickly, so what changed? Well, here's what. Western Europe. Gradually things there have been building up. Gradually the leaders of the Western European powers have become more and more fed up with the White House's tactics of armtwisting and not giving a hoot in hell for Europe. The last straw, as I see it, was Reagan's decision to block the gas pipeline deal. President Mitterrand said "no" most emphatically. Chancellor Schmidt said "nein" no less clearly and Margaret Thatcher, of all people, told the American President to go ride his bronco. I can't recall anything like it since the European Alliance's creation after World War II. Never before has any U.S. President generated such opposition, if not outright animosity.

I think we've reason to believe he was shocked and concerned. Naturally, there was no way the U.S. administration was going to lose face by publicly acknowledging it had done something clumsy in the first place. So since the supposedly bad situation in Poland was allegedly the reason for the sanctions and since the sanctions have clearly and rather painfully boomeranged, the situation in Poland had to change, and it has, as the President informed farmers in Iowa. One looks upon all this and the present U.S. policies in general and shakes one's head in disbelief.

POLISH MEDIA CITED ON ANTI-POLISH ACTIVITIES

PM021545 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jul 82 p 3

[TASS report: "According To Someone Else's Scenario"]

[Text] Warsaw, 29 Jul -- The Polish Government's measures aimed at normalizing the domestic political situation in the country are causing a spiteful reaction among Solidarity extremists entrenched in the West, ZOLNIERZ WOLNOSCI writes. Acting according to "scenarios" inspired by Western special services, the newspaper notes, these servants of imperialism are spreading slanderous information about the situation in Poland with fanatical hatred, brazenly demanding the toughening of discriminatory economic measures against Poland and calling on the Polish people to "disobey" the authorities.

The PAP agency has cited facts indicating that Solidarity extremists operating in a number of West European countries are openly engaging in anti-Polish activities.

It is reported that a gathering of Solidarity ringleaders was held in the Norwegian city of Sundvollen, where they discussed the stepping up subversive activities and called on Western countries to boycott Polish imports.

It was decided to create another propaganda center under the title of the "Solidarity Coordinating Bureau Abroad," whose headquarters is to be in Brussels. In its activity, the "Bureau" intends to closely cooperate with the existing "Solidarity committees" in the United States, Britain, the FRG and other NATO countries.

According to the PAP report, energetic subversive activities are being carried out by the Solidarity information bureau in Stockholm. Its repertoire of anti-Polish propaganda, the agency notes, includes the spreading of false reports about events in Poland, calls for economic sanctions, the holding of anti-Polish street demonstrations and the boycotting of Polish cultural events in Sweden. Thus, one representative of the bureau, speaking on Swedish television, "proposed" to Western countries that they declare a trade boycott with Poland and the USSR.

By currying favor with their Western hosts, the Solidarity extremists hope to obtain assistance for continuing their activities hostile to the Polish people and state, ZOLNIERZ WOLNOSCI stresses.

MOSCOW LEADERS GREET POLISH COUNTERPARTS

PM031411 Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 22 Jul 82 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Congratulations Telegram"]

[Text] V.V. Grishin, first secretary of Moscow CPSU Gorkom, and V.F. Promyslov, chairman of Moscow Gorispolkom, have sent a telegram to M. Wozniak, first secretary of Warsaw PZPR Voivodship Committee, and M. Debicki, mayor of Warsaw. It said:

On behalf of Moscow CPSU Gorkom, Moscow Gorispolkom and all Muscovites, we send cordial congratulations on the national holiday -- the 38th anniversary of Poland's rebirth -- to you, to the Warsaw PZPR Voivodship Committee, to the Warsaw City People's Council and to the Polish capital's working people.

Soviet-Polish combat cooperation, which was born in our common struggle against fascism during World War II, was a reliable foundation for building socialism on Polish soil.

We highly rate the traditional friendly ties which formed during that time between Moscow and Warsaw and express the confidence that the friendship and fruitful cooperation between our capitals will strengthen and develop in the interests of the Soviet and Polish peoples and for the sake of socialism and peace.

Muscovites, like all Soviet people, are convinced that at this complex time for Poland, the Communists and working class under the PZPR's leadership and guided by the fraternal help and support of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, will overcome all difficulties and consolidate the gains of socialism in the Polish People's Republic.

We wish you, dear friends, and the Warsaw PZPR Voivodship organization and Warsaw working people successes in socialist building.

Long live the inviolable Soviet-Polish friendship!

PRAVDA: LCY PLENUM VIEWS SOCIOECONOMIC PROBLEMS

PM031029 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jul 82 p 4

[Dispatch from correspondent V. Sharov: "LCY Central Committee Plenum"]

[Text] Belgrade, 29 Jul -- The Yugoslav press is commenting on the results of the LCY Central Committee plenum held in Belgrade the other day.

The plenum's work has aroused great interest in the country, which can be attributed to a number of reasons, primarily its agenda. The LCY Central Committee and Central Committee Presidium program of activities to implement the decisions of the 12th LCY Congress held in June this year was discussed.

The supreme forum of Yugoslav Communists was an important event in the life of the party and country. It has revitalized the party organizations' work. The campaign to stabilize and put the national economy on the path of intensive development is becoming increasingly widespread. At the same time, however, negative processes still exist in the economy -- the rate of development is still slowing down and prices are rising; the export plan has not been fulfilled and the revenue from tourism is down. Needless to say, party organizations and labor collectives were looking to the Central Committee plenum for a specific action program whose formulation, according to one of the speakers at the plenum, "is a political task of the first magnitude."

The keynote speaker -- N. Stojanovic, secretary of the LCY Central Committee Presidium -- and those who spoke in the debate pointed out that the attention of the party and its Central Committee must be focused on questions relating to economic stabilization. As N. Stojanovic said, "The public trusts and expects that something specific and substantial will be done in the sphere of economic stabilization in the immediate future."

Increasing production, above all, of exports, was designated as one of the main tasks facing the party, the Central Committee and society as a whole. It was moved that questions relating to the agroindustrial complex's development be examined at a Central Committee plenum. It was pointed out in this connection that for more than 2 years now, attempts to harmonize the positions of republics and provinces and to sign an agreement on the development of agriculture in 1981-1985 have proved fruitless.

Many speakers referred to the inefficiency of the present planning mechanism and the failure to honor accords already reached. In view of this, said M. Planinc, president of the Federal Executive Council, the government must take administrative measures to regulate the economic processes in the most important spheres. This applies to currency questions and to the country's solvency, oil imports and other problems.

In his plenum address, S. Dolanc, federal secretary of internal affairs and member of the LCY Central Committee, voiced some concern at the rise in crime in the country, especially in the economic sphere. As he put it, encroachments on public property are becoming a serious problem.

Other problems, the functioning of the political system in particular, attracted the plenum participants' attention. For example, the Yugoslav press quoted the following statement by N. Pasic, member of the LCY Central Committee: "As society's leading force, the LCY really must see that there is a widening gap between the goals we are proclaiming and what is happening in the country. The question inevitably arises: How far in practice is a political system of democracy based on self-management an effective instrument in the struggle for the working class' interests?"

Practically every speaker referred to the need to improve intraparty work and to ensure the LCY's vanguard role -- a sine qua non for the implementation of the 12th LCY Congress decisions.

As follows from the plenum materials, the work program of the Central Committee and its Presidium to be adopted at the next Central Committee session will incorporate other topical questions bearing on party and social life. In particular, it is proposed to analyze progress to date in implementing the action program for normalizing the situation in the Kosovo Autonomous Province adopted a year ago. Among questions relating to international politics to be discussed is that of developing cooperation between the SFRY and neighboring countries.

LCY Central Committee and Central Committee Presidium commissions were set up at the plenum, in particular for the LCY's development and cadre policy; ideological and theoretical work in the LCY; international cooperation; questions of national defense and social self-defense and questions relating to the history of the LCY.

IZVESTIYA: W. EUROPE BECOMING U.S. 'SERVITOR'

LD031720 Moscow TASS in English 1507 GMT 3 Aug 82

[Text] Moscow August 3 TASS -- "Having agreed to the deployment of U.S. medium-range missile systems, West Germany has found itself in the snare of Washington's 'hawkish' course and voluntarily put its head onto the block of a possible nuclear conflict," IZVESTIYA writes today.

"Moreover, West Germany can only have any substantial influence on the decision of whether a war should be launched until it has these weapons deployed on its territory. If missiles appear on West German soil, the country will be 'blown to smithereens' in any conflict. They believed on the Rhine that the missiles will help to 'fit together' the security concepts of the United States and its West European allies. However, far from drawing closer, the security interests of the partners are getting out of joint. The United States is acquiring a possibility to localise a nuclear war in Europe so as not to get singed by the conflagration."

"Bonn has overlooked one more circumstance," the article continues. "Western Europe stuffed with nuclear weapons is being tied so tightly to the U.S. military juggernaut that it is automatically becoming an obedient U.S. servitor. Wherever in the world the Pentagon may start an armed venture, Western Europe, primarily West Germany, can find itself involved in it against its will and contrary to its interests. Lastly -- and this is understood not only by experts -- 'rearmament,' far from strengthening, weakens West German security because any country deploying on its territory nuclear missiles is offering itself as a target for nuclear strikes."

LIPOVOY: GREEKS ANGRY AT U.S. SUBVERSION PLANS

PM031231 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Jul 82 Morning Edition p 4

[Correspondent B. Lipovoy's report under the rubric "On a Topical Theme:" "Dangerous Plans"]

[Text] Athens -- Reports leaked to the press on how the Pentagon, in conjunction with the CIA, has launched active training of special subunits for conducting subversive operations in the event of a military conflict have had a bombshell effect in Greece.

The Aegean Sea, with its more than 2,000 islands, has been chosen as the main base from which these subunits are to launch their operations. As the Athens newspaper TO VIMA reports, the formation of special commando subunits that include experienced CIA agents as well as military has already been completed and they have begun training.

But even in peacetime, the commando subunits will not be idle. According to secret instruction signed by U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger, the New York TIMES newspaper notes, the formations "must be capable of rebuffing any small-scale attack on regions of vital U.S. interests and hindering the growth of the influence of the USSR and its allies."

The instructions discuss with cynical frankness how the United States must discard the generally accepted norms of respect for other peoples' sovereign rights and noninterference in their internal affairs when it is a question "of a direct threat to vital U.S. interests." And the geographical limits of operations by these subunits, which will if necessary receive support from the three branches of the U.S. Armed Forces, are extended to virtually the whole of the eastern Mediterranean and the Persian Gulf.

The reports in the press have caused profound concern among the Greek public, who have long been opposed to the use of their country's territory for subversive purposes. Many of the country's public organizations have resolutely protested the American military presence on Greek territory, demanding the immediate removal of all American military bases from Crete, from near Athens and from the north of the country as well as the special subunits and groups which have been formed on Greek territory.

PRAVDA EDITORIAL ARTICLE ON LEBANON 4 AUGUST

LD032222 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2130 GMT 3 Aug 82

[Quotation marks as received]

[Text] Moscow, 4 Aug (TASS) -- The newspaper PRAVDA today published an editorial article [redaktsionnaya statya] under the headline "End the Aggression." Here follows the text of this article:

"The Lebanon tragedy is into its second month. Tens of thousands killed and wounded, hundreds of thousands left homeless, ruined towns and villages, devastated Palestinian refugee camps: these are the results of the bloody aggression by the Israeli military. Israeli troops are making one attempt after another to storm west Beirut. Tanks, planes, artillery and warships have been pitched against the courageous defenders of the city.

Never before has the racist nature of international Zionism, reared by American imperialism, presented itself in such an openly misanthropic form. It is no accident that the tragedy of Lebanon has brought back to mankind's memory the most sinister picture of the past, the crimes of Nazi Germany. The world was indignant on seeing how far Washington's support for Tel Aviv's aggressive plans goes and how excessive are the ambitions of the Israeli leaders who are ready to pave with human corpses the path to the implementation of the absurd idea of creating a 'greater Israel."

What is happening in Lebanon is genocide in the fullest meaning of the term: the deliberate, calculated destruction of the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples, of peaceful civilians -- men, women, children and old people. Bombs are rained down on their heads, they are thrown into concentration camps and jails to rot.

Few examples can be found in modern history of such unrestrained behavior, the flouting of the elementary standards of international law or the sovereignty and independence of other states. Israel is occupying more than one-third of Lebanon and wiping the Lebanese capital from the face of the earth. The Israelis are behaving like colonial conquerors of the worst times. As President I. Sarkis of Lebanon put it, they are paralyzing the work of the lawful local Lebanese authorities and setting up their own. They are attacking the barracks of the regular Lebanese Army, disarming the army's units and subdivisions, arresting servicemen and, finally, subjecting Lebanese parliamentary deputies to arrest.

It is completely obvious that the aggressor could not behave so impudently unless one of the largest imperialist powers was behind it as a partner. That is why responsibility for the crimes in Lebanon also rests with the United States.

However, Israel's calculations of gaining an easy victory, forcing a capitulation of the Palestinians and foisting a "new order" on Lebanon are turning out to be miscalculations, although the Lebanon operation was meticulously prepared and planned.

A military machine was thrown at Lebanon with modern technology. The arsenals of the Pentagon and the American exchequer were thrown wide open to Tel Aviv. What is more, the American-Israeli 'memorandum on strategic cooperation,' signed last year, provided for coordination of operations in the Middle East.

Finally, the wide-scale aggression was carefully rehearsed in 1978, when a 35,000-strong Isareli Army invaded Lebanese territory. It was equipped with the Camp David deal with Egypt, with Cairo's desertion from the pan-Arab ranks. If we had not been able to count on this agreement, former head of Isareli military intelligence Shlomo Gazit stated, the Isareli Army would not have been able to concentrate so many forces in the north and create such a threat on the Lebanon-Syria front.'

And still, despite the calculations of a blitzkrieg, the Israeli war machine is skidding. French television has noted that that there is increasingly frequent talk in authoritative circles in Israel that the Israeli troops 'have got bogged down' in Lebanon.

The aggressor has come up against stubborn resistance from the Palestinians, whose courage evokes admiration. That the PLO fighters 'in the course of this war showed persistence and skill which should not be underestimated', is the admission now being made by Israeli paper YEDI'OT AHARONOT. 'The Israeli soldiers who for many years despised the fedayeen have realized this bitter truth from their own sorrowful experience. The young PLO fighters showed no little valor as they rose to their full height and rushed at tanks with grenade launchers in their hands.'

The Israeli military is suffering substantial losses. Even according to official figures, the number of killed and wounded amounts to some 2,000. Proportionate to the population, the American press writes, this is equivalent to losses of 100,000 for the United States. The aggression has proved a heavy burden on Israel's economy. Indeed, Israel is daily spending some $100 million on the military operations.

In the country itself the antiwar movement that has developed during the war is gaining momentum as a reaction to the senseless adventurist course of the Israeli rulers.

By their struggle the Palestinians have proved with renewed force that they are defending a vital cause, that the Palestinian problem cannot be cut with a sword like the Gordian knot, cannot be razed to the ground in the way the Israeli military is doing with Lebanese towns. This is a political problem which can be resolved only by political means. French President F. Mitterrand noted: Even if Israel succeeds in neutralizing the Palestine Liberation Organization as a military and political force, 'this will not alter the right of the people to have their own country'.

Meanwhile, Tel Aviv is trying to ignore the realities of the Near East situation. By annihilating west Beirut the Israeli military aims not only to flout the lawful rights of the Palestinian people but it also hopes to transfer yet one more Arab country, Lebanon, into its zone of occupation by extending the territory it has seized.

American diplomacy is working toward the same ends. By stubbornly and unceremoniously undermining the UN Security Council resolutions that call for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the occupiers' troops from Lebanese soil, the United States is providing the aggressor with political cover. With a will worthy of a better use, the U.S. President's special envoy P. Habib scurries between Beirut and Tel Aviv and roams throughout the Near East and West Europe.

What is the American envoy so busily seeking? He is trying to arrange the evacuation of Palestinian fighting men from west Beirut and the landing in Lebanon of 'multinational forces', the core of which is to be made up of American units. Here again, the United States is assuming the role of 'savior' of Beirut from more destruction and more casualties. The Palestinians and Lebanese can only be saved from death by stopping the aggressor, by demanding that the interventionists clear out of somebody else's territory. But Washington does not have anything to say about that. Instead of the evacuation of the occupiers, it is calling for the expulsion of those who are resisting the oppressors with arms in hand.

As for the 'multinational forces' that, it is claimed, are destined to disengage the hostile sides in Lebanon, the temporary UN troops already stationed there could be used for this purpose. There are also the inter-Arab forces which include Syrian units; there are the Lebanese forces. Why should American assault troops suddenly be needed? Probably because the Israeli military needs American reinforcements, and the Pentagon has long set its sights on the Lebanese bridgehead.

In essence Washington's actions are directed toward consolidating the gains of Israel's aggression. To this end the complex internal political situation in Lebanon is also being exploited. Stake is being placed on the lack of unity in the Arab world, which hinders the rendering of effective aid to the Palestinians, and on deepening the split among the Arabs.

The Middle East situation, which as been maintained for many years now, arose through the fault of Israel and the United States. It is precisely they who are sabotaging the resolution of cardinal problems. The right of the Palestinian people to the formation of their own independent state has not materialized. The occupation of the Arab territories captured by Israel as long ago as 1967 continues. Tel Aviv's latest adventure in Lebanon, carried out with the complicity of the United States, merely increases the burden of the accumulated problems. The Israeli military's heinous crimes, committed with the complicity of the United States, are sowing the seeds of hatred and animosity and new conflicts in the Middle East, deepening the gulf between Israel and the Arab peoples and states. Israel is virtually placing itself outside the international community, whose wishes and demands it is crudely and unceremoniously flouting.

The aggressor and its patrons are aiming to consolidate the fruits of the present and all the preceding predatory wars and establish its hehemony.

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, its constructive attitude to the developments in Lebanon and to the situation in the Middle East as a whole is aimed not at putting up new obstacles, but at removing the roadblocks standing in the way of a Middle East settlement. This position was most clearly set forth in L.I. Brezhnev's answers to the questions of the newspaper PRAVDA as well as during his friendly meeting with G. Husak in the Crimea, where it was noted that the USSR and Czechoslovakia most resolutely condemn Israel's criminal aggression against sovereign Lebanon and the Palestinian people, as well as Washington's open assistance to Tel Aviv.

The flames of war should be extinguished and a stop should be put to the aggression, the Israeli troops should withdraw from Lebanon's territory -- such are the demands of the Soviet Union. The first and most immediate step toward this is the lifting of the siege of Beirut and disengagement of the forces defending West Beirut and the Israeli troops. One can only welcome the new resolution of the UN Security Council against which, in an atmosphere of total international condemnation of the aggressor, not even the American representative dared to speak. Now it is a matter of implementating it. As for Washington's solicitations, the Soviet Union is categorically opposed to the appearance of American troops on Lebanese soil, and an appropriate warning has been given to the United States on this score.

Israel's aggression in Lebanon has already met with sharp condemnation throughout the world -- in the UN General Assembly, at the nonaligned countries' meeting in Nicosia, at the confernece of foreign ministers of Arab states in Tunis. The more cohesive the forces opposing the Israeli venture, the quicker and more surely will it be ended. The Arabs' unity of action and active role in this are undoubtedly acquiring key importance. It is becoming more and more urgent and obvious that they must jointly work out measures to ensure the legitimate vital rights of the Palestinians, casting aside at this critical hour everything that prevents them from achieving unity of action.

As for the Soviet Union, our country has given and will give aid and support to those who do not bow their heads before the aggressor, who work for a just settlement and peace in this region. The broad international response to the answers of L.I. Brezhnev to PRAVDA's questions testifies to the fact that the consistent, principled position of the USSR enjoys the recognition and respect of wide circles of the internation public.

The Lebanese adventure by Israel and its accomplices and the possibility that it may be repeated in any other Arab country once again raises in all its acuteness the question of the need for a just and comprehensive settlement in the Near East. 'The sad experience of decades filled with acts of aggression and military conflicts has shown that the path of armed confrontation, like that of separate deals, has not brought and cannot bring a settlement of the Near East problems, L.I. Brezhnev has pointed out.

They are susceptible to settlement only as a result of collective efforts on the part of all sides concerned, including the PLO as the only legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. Looking ahead, it is with this in mind that we see the value of our proposal for the convening of an international conference, and the sooner the better. The Soviet Union is ready to take practical action to that end, and to cooperate honestly with all who would like to make a contribution to the establishment of a lasting peace in the Near East.

The situation is so serious and critical, says L.I. Brezhnev's message to the President of the United States, that the most immediate action is required. The message from the Soviet head of state emphasizes that should a tragedy occur in Lebanon, and particularly to the population of its capital, it would be an indelible stain on the conscience of those who could have stopped the aggressor but failed to do so.

The events in Lebanon show that a settlement of the Near East problems brooks no delay. An end must be put to the aggression against Lebanon. The adoption of effective measures to stop it must not be put off.

BREZHNEV MESSAGE, USSR MIDEAST POLICY VIEWED

LD031656 Moscow World Service in English 1300 GMT 3 Aug 82

[Text] The situation in Lebanon has aggravated sharply. The Israeli aggressors, with the encouragement of the United States, are stepping up their treacherous actions, and as a result the peaceful residents of Beirut are being ruthlessly killed and the city destroyed. In this complicated situation, of special importance is the message sent by President Leonid Brezhnev to the President of the United States, and here's what a Radio Moscow commentator writes:

The Soviet leader has urged the United States President to urgently use all opportunities at his disposal to prevent the further destruction of the people in Beirut. The situation is so serious and critical, says the message, that the most immediate measures are required. The tragedy of Lebanon and especially of the population in its capital will be a permanent blemish on the conscience of those who could have stopped the aggressor but didn't do it.

Leonid Brezhnev's message to the United States President shows again that the Soviet Union takes a very clear stand as regards the events in Lebanon. Flames of war should be put out, the aggression stopped, and the Israeli aggressors should be withdrawn from Lebanese territory. As for the immediate objectives, it's necessary to end the siege of Beirut and stop at once the mass destruction of the Lebanese and Palestinian population. And as a first step to this, the Soviet Union has nothing against separating the forces defending west Beirut and the Israeli troops. For this purpose, United Nations forces could be used. At the same time, the Soviet Union is categorically against the introduction of American forces on Lebanese territory -- and Washington has such plans.

The war started by Israel against Lebanon has made the Middle East problem on the whole especially pressing. The sad experience of the last few decades has shown that the road of armed confrontations, as well as the road of separate deals such as the Camp David agreement, has not solved the problem of the Middle East, and can't solve it. This can be achieved only by solving a whole series of issues which can really stabilize the situation. First of all, it's necessary to withdraw to ensure the rights of the Palestinians to life, security, to an independent development, to a homeland and to forming a state of their own. The Middle East problem can be solved only through collective efforts of all the interested sides, including the Palestine Liberation Organisation, as the sole representative of the Palestinian people. And in this respect, the Soviet proposal on convening an international conference on the Middle East continues to be very important.

In its stand on the Middle East, the Soviet Union is guided both by the interests of universal peace and also by the fact that the Middle East is located very close to its southern borders, and developments in the area can't but affect the interests of the Soviet Union. As was pointed out many times, the Soviet Union is ready to cooperate loyally with all those who want to contribute to establishing a stable peace in the Middle East, and intend to do all they can in this respect.

Comparison

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 3 August publishes on its front page a TASS report entitled "L.I. Brezhnev's Message to the U.S. President." This report has been compared with the Moscow World Service report published in the 3 August Soviet Union DAILY REPORT on page H 1, and the following variations have been noted:

In the first paragraph, last line, PRAVDA reads ...civilians are pitilessly being killed and.... (adding "pitilessly")

In the second paragraph, line one, PRAVDA reads ...use his powers most urgently to stop the... (adding "most urgently")

In the second paragraph, lines four to five, PRAVDA reads ...in particular will be an indelible blot also on the conscience.... (rewording)

Arab Media Cited

LD031632 Moscow TASS in English 1455 GMT 3 Aug 82

[Text] Damascus August 3 TASS -- Reporting on Leonid Brezhnev's message to the President of the United States, the Syrian news agency SANA writes that the Soviet leader has drawn the attention of the American President to the fact that as a result of the perfidious actions of Israel, which has again violated the ceasefire agreement and launched a massive offensive against west Beirut, peaceful inhabitants are being mercilessly killed and the city devastated. Leonid Brezhnev has urged the U.S. president to use all means at his disposal to put an end to the extermination of people in Beirut, the agency stressed.

Amman August 3 TASS -- The Jordanian national television and radio have quoted in all of their news programmes Leonid Brezhnev's message to the President of the United States and pointed out that the appeal of the head of the Soviet state to Reagan is a reflection of the Soviet Union's concern about the destiny of the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples. The USSR has most resolutely called upon the United States to curb the Israeli aggressor in Lebanon, the report said.

Cairo August 3 TASS -- Leonid Brezhnev urges Reagan to put an end to the Israeli aggression, the Cairo newspaper Al-AHRAM points out. The newspaper notes that the extremely serious and critical situation in Lebanon necessitates the adoption of immediate measures to put the stop to the mass extermination of the peaceful population. The tragedy of Lebanon will be an indelible stain on the conscience of those who could stop the aggressor, but have not done so, the newspaper AL-AHRAM points out.

Tunis August 3 TASS -- Leonid Brezhnev's message to the U.S. President is fresh convincing evidence of the USSR's serious concern about the situation in Lebanon in connection with the escalation of Israel's aggressive actions in that country with the direct [word indistinct] of the USA, says the commentary of the Tunisian radio and television.

GERASIMOV DISCOUNTS REAGAN REMARKS ON LEBANON

LD031804 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1300 GMT 3 Aug 82

[APN political observer Gennadiy Gerasimov commentary; from the Vremya newscast]

[Text] Hello, comrades! The bombing and shelling of the western part of Beirut on 1 August was extremely heavy -- it was a bloody Sunday. The ruins recall pictures of World War II. What is more, the city is blockaded. They are relying on bloodshed there, planning to bomb Lebanon into becoming an ally, to provoke treachery by a demonstration of suffering -- especially as the political situation there is complex -- and to force the Lebanese to turn their backs on the Palestinians.

Here is a tree with common roots: the right-hand side is a Lebanese cedar, the left, a Palestinian olive tree. The Israeli military axe would like to split it, the united blood, and the suffering of Beirut to continue.

In his message to President Ronald Reagan, Leonid Ilich Brezhnev called upon him as a most urgent matter to make use of the opportunities he has to prevent the continuing annihilation of the people in Beirut. Yesterday Reagan met Shamir and allegedly stressed in the talks the need for a cease-fire. Later, already in an aircraft on his way to the midwest, Reagan put forward two arguments as evidence for his assertion that he aspires to a cease-fire and even to an end to the suffering.

Let us look at these arguments. The first of the President's arguments is that this is the aim of Mr Habib's efforts. The U.S. President's special emissary, who incidentally has been given no powers by anyone else, is undertaking these efforts, but they are openly pro-Israeli, to try to help it achieve politically the aims it cannot achieve by military means -- to avenge itself on the Palestinians and to make Lebanon obedient.

The second of the President's arguments relatesto the efforts os U.S. diplomacy in the United Nations. The efforts here also are unambiguous -- support for what Washington sees as a strategic ally. In the Security Council session on Monday that demanded the lifting of the siege of Beirut, the United States was the only member of the council which did not support the demand, thus once again giving its blessing to the aggressor.

The United States is an accomplice in war crimes. Economic and military aid for Israel continues, and Habib and Jeane Kirkpatrick, who represents the United States at the United Nations, are providing political support. Things have gone so far that one official in Washington has stated that Begin is behaving as though Reagan were his subordinate; this is reported by the Washington POST. The tail is wagging the dog; it is time they changed places. Those who could have stopped the aggressor but did not will have an ineradicable stain on their conscience.

SHAMIR CONCLUDES OFFICIAL VISIT TO U.S.

LD040730 Moscow TASS in English 0722 GMT 4 Aug 82

[Text] Washington August 4 TASS -- Israeli Foreign Minister Shamir concluded his official visit to the United States during which he held talks with President Ronald Reagan, Secretary of State George Shultz, Defence Secretary Caspar Weinbergerand also with the leadership of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress.

The trip of the Israeli minister was prompted by the need to hold urgent consultations for the purposes of coordinating futher aggressive actions of Tel Aviv in Lebanon.

Addressing journalists after the conclusions of the talks, Shamir made it plain that Israel continues counting on utter backing by the United States.

According to him, it is important that Washington and Tel Aviv continue maintaining close relations with each other. He stressed that the United States and Israel have similar purposes with regard to Lebanon. Tel Aviv's emissary made no secret what these aims are: He brazenly demanded withdrawal of the forces of the Palestinian resistance movement from west Beirut and expulsion of the Palestine Liberation Organization from Lebanon. And he did not say a word about withdrawal of Iraeli forces from Lebanon.

The Israeli minister made no secret that his talks in Washington revealed complete identity of views not only with the administration but also with legislators. According to him, the attitude of the Congress leadership to Israel's policy is "very positive."

The results of Shamir's visit show that the White House despite its vague statements about the need of ending combat operations and violence in Beirut in reality intends to continue backing piratic actions of the Israeli military against the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples. Concern is expressed here that this connivance with the Israeli aggression by Washington might prompt Tel Aviv to further widening of the aggression against the PLO and Lebanon.

While the Israeli minister addressed newsmen the Pentagon's representative announced that a unit of U.S. warships carrying a 1,800-strong shock batallion of Marines is now heading for the shores of Italy. He said that if needed the Marines can be brought to Lebanon within 72 hours.

Joint Statement Derided

LD032018 Moscow in Arabic to the Arab World 1530 GMT 3 Aug 82

[Text] Israeli Foreign Minister Yitzhaq Shamir has visited the United States. The visit coincided -- we do not know whether it was by chance or not -- with the deterioration of the situation in the Middle East due to the intensification of the barbaric Israeli air raids on west Beirut and the attempt to take the Lebanese capital (?by force). The concomitant events increased interest in the talks which Shamir held with Reagan and his secretary of state, Shultz.

It would be normal to expect Washington to demand of the Begin administration's envoy that the aggression be halted -- even if formally and in response to the demands of world public opinion and UN resolutions. However, this did not happen. After the so-called working dinner with Secretary of State Shultz and Defense Secretary Weinberger, Shamir (?loudly) stated that there would be no problems regarding getting the most up-to-date U.S. weapons. In simpler terms, the United States will continue supplying Tel Aviv with the necessary weapons for aggression against the Arabs. After the working dinner with members of the Reagan administration, Shamir stated that the question of Israel's use of cluster and pellet bombs was not discussed, and that in the end, the two sides talked about ways of forcing the Palestinians to leave west Beirut.

Did the Israeli foreign minister's meeting with Reagan change anything? No, and, in addition, the AFP correspondent in Washington said of the outcome of this meeting, the Reagan administration even refused to condemn Israel for its actions in Lebanon. In their joint statement, Reagan and Shamir said that they objected to the escalation of violence in Lebanon -- this statement is a clear falsification of the truth, particularly in the light of the U.S. decision to continue supplying Israel with the most up-to-date weapons.

NOVOYE VREMYA EDITORIAL ON LEBANESE SETTLEMENT

PM040955 Moscow NOVOYE VREMYA in Russian No 31, 30 Jul 82 p 1

[Editorial: "Moscow Makes It Clear"]

[Excerpt] The crux of a Near East settlement is the solution of the Palestinian problem, and this problem is not a Gordian knot to be cut by a sword.

The best, realistic way of solving it, as the Soviet Union has said more than once, is to set up an independent Palestinian state. This idea was stressed by L.I. Brezhnev in his replies to PRAVDA's questions published on 21 July. In his replies, which had a wide international impact, the Soviet leader expounded in a clear-cut and lucid manner a constructive and realistic program for the settlement of the situation in Lebanon and in the Near East as a whole.

First of all, it is essential that Israel and the United States fulfill the UN Security Council decision on bringing to an end the aggression against sovereign Lebanon and on the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanon. The lifting of the Israeli forces' siege of Beirut must take precedence. L.I. Brezhnev noted that the USSR is not against the disengagement of the forces defending west Beirut and the Israeli forces as the first step in this direction. UN forces could be used for that purpose, especially as contingents of the UN interim force are already in Lebanon in line with a Security Council decision. The Soviet Union will continue to categorically oppose the idea of U.S. forces on Lebanese soil.

The Soviet Union has given and will continue to give aid and support to those who are not submitting to the aggressor and who are seeking a just settlement and lasting peace in the Near East, the head of the Soviet state stressed.

In the present acute and critical situation, Arab unity and joint Arab actions to safeguard the Palestinian's right to exist, the right to security and independent development and to set up their own state are of key significance.

How much ink has Western and, above all, U.S. propaganda used in assuring everyone that the Camp David separate agreements will bring peace to the Near East! The Lebanese tragedy has graphically demonstrated what kind of "peace" Washington and Tel Aviv planned at Camp David.

The sad experience of decades filled with acts of aggression and military conflicts shows that, like the path of separate deals, the path of armed confrontation has not led and cannot lead to the settlement of Near East problems. These problems can only be solved by the collective efforts of all interested sides, including, of course, the PLO -- sole legitimate representatives of the Palestinian people.

That is why, in his replies to PRAVDA, L.I. Brezhnev again drew attention to the Soviet Union's previous proposal on convening an international conference on the Near East, and the sooner this idea is implemented the better. The USSR is ready to work pratically in that direction by cooperating fairly with all those who want to contribute to the establishment of a lasting and just peace in the Near East.

RPP DEFENSE OF SOVIET ARMS, AID TO ARABS

LD031900 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Arabic to the Arab World 1630 GMT 3 Aug 82

[Text] Maj Gen Mustafa Talas, Syrian defense minister and deputy supreme commander of the armed forces, has praised the Soviet policy of support for the defenders of Lebanon. In a statement to the Syrian information media, Mustafa Talas said that Syrian fighters of the Arab deterrent forces in Lebanon, using Soviet arms, have destroyed 400 Israeli tanks and 60 Israeli airplanes of various types. In particular, he highlighted the successful use of Syrian tanks in combat with American-made Israeli tanks.

Relying on Soviet military aid, the defenders of Lebanon have foiled the Israeli surprise offensive and waged a war of attrition against the Israeli Army. The Begin clique and its mentors are being isolated both locally and internationally. All this categorically refutes the false claims about Soviet indifference to the fate of the defenders of Lebanon.

Under present conditions, the USSR is providing the Arabs with the maximum possible aid, both in words and deeds. It is doing all it can to enable the defenders of Lebanon to check the Israeli aggression and stand fast at a time when the leaders of those Arab countries that are not members of the Steadfastness and Confrontation Front have been running away from the struggle to check the Israeli piracy and at a time when the influential political forces in Lebanon have been cooperating with the invaders.

It is noteworthy that the fabrications about Soviet indifference toward the Arab-Israeli conflict emanate from the Arab and non-Arab circles that are opposed to the Arab national liberation movement. These circles give the impression that they want the USSR to shoulder the entire responsibility on behalf of the Arabs for checking the Israeli aggression by armed force. One cannot but ask why those who criticize the USSR are cooperating with the protectors of the Israeli aggressors on the pretext of the alleged Soviet threat. Why do they equate the USSR, which helps the Arabs in the struggle to end the Israeli agression, and the United States, which supports the aggressors by every means?

Evidently, the clamor about the USSR's alleged indifference toward the Arab-Israeli conflict has been raised for provocative purposes. Some greatly desire creating the necessary conditions that would prompt American imperialism to participate directly in the process of annihilating the Palestinians and other Arabs. They turn a blind eye to the fact that by its diplomatic activities the USSR has been thwarting plans to internationalize the Lebanese conflict and has been providing help to the defenders of Lebanon for that very reason. They also turn a blind eye to the fact that direct U.S. intervention on the side of the aggressors will have grave consequences affecting not only the peoples of the Middle Eastern countries, but the peace of the entire world as well.

There is yet another important point which should be raised: The leveling of false allegations against the USSR underlines the need for the consolidation of all the anti-imperialist forces in the Middle East to save the Palestinians and Lebanese from the Israeli beasts and to shoulder their duties. These duties must not be laid on the shoulders of others.

PDRY Chairman 'Ali Nasir Muhammad al-Hasani has stated that those who are demanding that the USSR enter the battlefield instead of the Arabs must be asked about the importance and role of the Arab army, Arab arms and Arab oil: Where is the Arab army, where are the Arab arms and where is the Arab oil? Why aren't all these being used to curb the Israeli aggression against Lebanon and the Palestinian Arab people?

The war being waged against Lebanon has shown that the attitude of some of the regimes in the Middle East and Near East toward this war do not differ in principle from that of the American imperialist circles. This is evidenced in particular by the fact that these regimes have been trying to thwart all attempts at holding an Arab summit conference to discuss Lebanon by constantly adjourning it.

U.S., ISRAEL ATTEMPT TO 'TORPEDO' UN EFFORTS

LD040908 Moscow TASS in English 0836 GMT 4 Aug 82

[Text] New York August 4 TASS — On the instructions of Security Council members its president Noel Dorr (Ireland) made an official statement expressing serious concern over the continued troop movements and fire in the area of Beirut.

Members of the Security Council again expressed support for the efforts of the U.N. secretary-general for the deployment of U.N. observers to ensure strict observance of the ceasefire agreement. It is said in this statement that all sides should cooperate with the UNO in this matter.

The statement was approved by all Security Council members only after consultations which lasted behind closed doors for a total of over seven hours.

The American representative adopted an obstructionist policy in an effort to provide a diplomatic cover for Israel's aggression.

American diplomats in the United Nations are shamelessly using all their set of procedural tricks to give the aggressor as much time as possible to consolidate the results of its brigandage. Thus, after the text of the statement was agreed upon the American delegate demanded that its publication should be postponed until he received instructions from his government. He was the only one among Security Council members who was not certain whether the aggressor should be called to order.

Richard Ovinnikov, the Soviet delegate, speaking at the Security Council meeting held after that, said: The United States could have stopped the Israeli aggressors today or yesterday or any time earlier. But it did not do so deliberately. Moreover, the entire policy of the USA is to do things it wants in the Middle East with Israel's hands.

It is now clear to the whole world, the Soviet delegate went on, how far Washington's support of Israeli aggression plans extends and how inordinate are the ambitions of the Israeli leaders who are prepared to strew with ruins of a whole country and thousands upon thousands of corpses the road to the realization of their crazy ideas for establishing a "great Israel".

Zuhdi Labib at-Tarazi, permanent observer of the Palestine Liberation Organization at the UNO, said that while U.S. representatives engage in phrase-mongering here Israeli troops continue demolishing Beirut and killing people. He informed Security Council members that precisely in those hours a column of 25 Israeli tanks and armoured personnel carriers crossed the border between two districts of the Lebanese capital and entered west Beirut.

The Security Council president stressed when closing the meeting that the situation in Lebanon remains on its agenda.

As is shown by the developments of the last few days, the aggressor and his American protectors are acting in full agreement with each other when trying to torpedo the U.N. efforts to bring about peace in Lebanon. While Washington's emissaries are putting up roadblocks in the way of settlement at the U.N. Headquarters their Israeli partners are doing everything possible to sabotage these efforts in the occupied Lebanon. This is shown by a new report published here by the U.N. secretary-general concerning the implementation of the Security Council's Resolution Number 516 which provides for deploying U.N. observers in the area of Beirut. As follows from this report Israel put off till August 5 even a decision on the question of whether or not it agreed to the presence of observers.

Even attempts to prepare for the deployment of U.N. observers were opposed by Tel Aviv. A spokesman for the U.N. secretary-general said that Israeli occupation troops stopped a group of 28 observers who were sent from An-Naqurah to Yarze, near Beirut, where the Lebanese Army now has its headquarters. As a temporary measure the U.N. Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar instructed on Tuesday the U.N. truce supervision headquarters in the Middle East to set up observation posts in the territory controlled by the Lebanese Government in order to report on the situation in Beirut and around it.

Tel Aviv's reaction to this U.N. step was the limit of cynicism and impudence. Israel's permanent representative sent a letter to the U.N. secretary-general in which he "protested" against the U.N. "unilateral action".

IZVESTIYA ATTACKS HABIB MIDEAST MISSIONS

PM040833 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Aug 82 Morning Edition p 5

[K. Geyvandov article under the rubric "Notes of a Political Observer": "Look Out: Habib's Mission"]

[Text] At the height of the Israeli military's barbaric bombing and massive artillery shelling of the western districts of Beirut, renewed in the last few days, revealing reports have appeared even in the NATO countries' mass media. "The Israeli Government," London's THE TIMES wrote, "has made an uncompromising statement to the effect that Israel's aim is now not only to remove the PLO from Beirut and Lebanon, but to destroy it as a political organization." To this, BBC Television added that "the Israeli Cabinet ...consented to the start of a mass offensive against west Beirut."

Observers have not failed to notice the fact that Israel's dirty war in Lebanon took this turn immediately after the departure from Beirut of the so-called special envoy of the U.S. President, P. Habib. He arrived in the region before the start of the present Israeli aggression. After the invasion of Lebanese territory by Tel Aviv's hordes, he firmly established himself in Beirut, declaring through the White House that he intended to embark on fulfilling his "peacemaking mission." The question can legitimately be asked: Who authorized Mr Habib to concern himself with "peacemaking" in the Near East, and when? Looking at the facts, it immediately emerges that nobody did, except the current White House incumbent and possibly his very close friend -- the Israeli premier.

Indeed, in the first few days after the start of Israel's present aggression, the UN Security Council studied this problem. Its Resolutions 508 and 509 contain a firm condemnation of the Tel Aviv rulers' actions and a demand for an immediate end to the aggression and the speedy, unconditional withdrawal of Israeli troops from Lebanon. But these documents nowhere state that anyone authorizes former American diplomat Mr Habib to undertake anything of the kind he has undertaken in Beirut over the last 6 weeks or more. In this context, we mention the UN Security Council decisions because even before the well-known Resolution 242 of 1967, which the U.S. administration is now calling on the Palestinians to recognize, the role of mediator in settling the Near East crisis was assigned to a UN representative.

True, since the U.S. Government managed to concoct the notorious Camp David agreements, Washington has been trying with all its might to introduce to the Near East new realities elaborated by the While House. One of these amounts to ignoring everyone and everything there as soon as it becomes an issue of the interests of American imperialism and its Zionist "strategic ally." The effect this has on the peoples of the Near East in practice can be seen, in particular, from the nature and results of the "peacemaking mission" which has been actively carried out in the region under the present U.S. administration by former diplomat P. Habib.

The transcript of the detailed briefing which the American President gives Mr Habib each time is not published, but judging from the handwriting of his work, the following conclusion can definitely be drawn: The main task facing this While House envoy is, by means of diplomacy of a dubious nature, to strive to politically legalize the results of the acts of aggression and international piracy perpetrated by Israel's rulers with the active support and complicity of the United States. That was the case when Israeli aircraft bombed the Iraqi nuclear reactor near Baghdad, that was the case last summer. When the Israeli military undertook a sharp escalation of armed provocations in southern Lebanon. P. Habib was in the Near East at exactly that time.

Nor is Habib's "mission" during the present Israeli aggression against Lebanon and the siege of west Beirut any excepttion.

After all, it is no secret that he has not lifted a finger to put an end to the genocide being perpetrated against the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples, but that, acting in essence as the aggressor's mouthpiece, he has bargained over terms for capitulation by the Palestinian resistance movement and the Lebanese national patriotic forces.

Moreover, with a speed more characteristic of military men than diplomats, the American envoy has grasped the fact that the Pentagon, which is close to his heart, could benefit from Tel Aviv's aggression. (Let us note, in parentheses, that it has emerged that Habib and U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger are both from the same American supermonopoly, Bechtel, which works on fulfilling military orders everywhere.) An urgent dispatch winged its way from Beirut to Washington to the effect that the United States could try, through Lebanon, to increase its military presence in the Near East, and this was followed without delay by President Reagan's directive from Washington on preparing battalions of the U.S. Rapid Deployment Force for dispatch to the Lebanese capital. So Habib was in no hurry to complete his talks in Beirut even when real possibilities emerged for ending the bloody tragedy for the western part of the city.

It is clear from everything that this development of events suits neither the American envoy nor his proteges -- the Tel Aviv Zionists. It does not correspond to their patterns for a "solution" to the Lebanese problem -- patterns reaffirmed with such cool brazenness toward a sovereign country during U.S. President Reagan's recent press conference. Not to mention the fact that a political solution to the problem of besieged west Beirut means the collapse of all their calculations of "eliminating" the Palestinian question.

Mr Habib then received instructions to leave Beirut and start shuttle operations to countries in the region. What is he concerned with in the Arab capitals? The same old thing. He tries with all his might to justify the Israeli aggression in Lebanon, the genocide against the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples. Making every effort, he tries to make the Arab leaders accept Tel Aviv's latest crimes as a fait accompli and take on themselves the main burden of their consequences.

One of Mr Habib's main concerns during this trip is to find a "homeland" [otechestvo] for the Palestinians, whom his masters and their underlings would now like to drive out of Lebanon. In other words, to implement the Zionist Israeli rulers' "idea" of dispersing the exiled people from Palestine to various Arab countries, enabling them to "remove this problem from the agenda." However, the Arab capitals did not find it particularly difficult to see through these intentions on the part of the American envoy, and even Egypt, the partner of the United States and Israel in the Camp David deal, pointed out to him that it regards Palestine as the only acceptable homeland for the Palestinians.

In this stance the American-Israeli "strategic allies" were not helped by the latest escalation in the brutalities against besieged west Beirut and its courageous defenders, undertaken with the aim of making Habib's "arguemnt" more "weighty" on the basis of the Israeli Government decisions we mentioned at the beginning of this article. These brutalities only confirmed the sentence, reworded from the colonial past and now almost a proverb in the region: When the sinister figure of Philip Habib appears in the Arab East, blood flows.

Yes, the wounds of the Lebanese and Palestinians, after the American envoy's return to Beirut, continue to bleed still more abundantly, and it is no accident that the Arabs constantly warn each other: Beware of Habib's "mission"! But President Reagan, cynically smiling at the press conference, says that Habib is "carrying out his mission splendidly."

U.S. DISPATCHING 'MERCENARIES' TO ISRAEL

LD031652 Moscow TASS in English 1446 GMT 3 Aug 82

[Text] Moscow August 3 TASS -- TASS news analyst Leonid Ponomarev writes:

The United States is sending to Israel so-called "volunteers" but as a matter of fact mercenaries. The first such contingent of 200 persons, part of some 750 contingent, which has been prepared, is being dispatched from New York today to be stationed on the occupied Syrian Golan Heights and in other areas.

A special mission of Israeli Zionists, which is staying in the USA, is recruiting mercenaries with the permission of the American authorities. At the first stage they are expected to be on police duties in the occupied Arab lands and carry out other missions in connection with the Israeli aggression against the Arab peoples.

Judging by the experience of the activities of American "advisers", who stayed once in Vietnam and now in El Salvador, American "volunteers" may take direct part in some form or another in the combat operations by the Israeli aggressors.

The Zionist recruiters encourage the American mercenaries by statements that they allegedly go to Israel in order to "serve their people and to help them in Israel", thus stressing to what degree the political and military interests of the ruling circles of Washington and Tel Aviv have merged.

Tel Aviv has already payed nearly three billion dollars for the Israeli aggression in Lebanon. But this, apparently, by no means worries the Zionist chiefs, because they are confident that the Reagan administration will undoubtedly make up for their spendings in connection with the war, even for the losses in manpower.

Even before the Israeli Army invaded Lebanon on June 6, the U.S. House Foreign Affairs Committee met the request of the Reagan administration for the appropriation of 1.7 billion dollars for military aid and 785 million dollars for economic aid to Israel for the year of 1983. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has increased the sum total of economic aid to reach 910 million dollars. It is noteworthy that the American "volunteers" -- mercenaries are being sent to Israel at a crucial juncture, when the U.N. Security Council and all honest people on earth are making every effort to put an end to the continuing extermination of people in Beirut and destruction of towns by the Israeli aggressors. Therefore the dispatch of American mercenaries can be interpreted only as Tel Aviv's and Washington's apparent intention to continue the bloodbath in the Middle East.

U.S., ISRAEL SHARE RESPONSIBILITY FOR LEBANON

Romberg Statement

LD032346 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1825 GMT 3 Aug 82

[From "The World Today" program presented by political observer Eduard Mnatsakanov]

[Text] Now, comrades, listen to what U.S. State Department official spokesman Romberg says about events in Lebanon. The U.S. Government, he said at his latest press conference in Washington, is deeply worried about the fate of the peaceful population in west Beirut and, because of this, the United States, jointly with Israel, is making active efforts to restore the normal supplies of necessary food, water and power to the city so as to save the innocent civilian population from further privation and suffering. Well, what humanists, what touching solicitude they display for the innocent civilian population because, jointly with Israel -- which means jointly with the murderers of the Palestinian and Lebanese people -- they are making efforts to limit the number of victims of aggression. What efforts?

Reading such statements, you marvel at the calm impudence and hypocrisy of their authors. The mask of philanthropy is worn by those who in just 6 months this year provided the aggressor with military aid worth a total of $2.5 billion and supplied to Israel 450 of its latest F-15 and F-16 aircraft, a large number of tanks, armored carriers, missiles, pellet, cluster and phosphorus bombs, who from the very beginning closely collaborated

with the aggressor, who at the United Nations and in the Security Council blocks any resolution on the peaceful settlement of the conflict; who do not stop political and diplomatic machinations in the Near East in favor of the aggressor.

It has now become very clear that Presidential special envoy to the Near East, Habib, has actually become the envoy of Begin and Sharon and is carrying out their wishes and their instructions. Habib promised Begin, the Washington POST says, that he will strive for clear and unambiguous assurances from the PLO, that this organization will leave the Lebanese capital. In his turn, another American newspaper writes, Begin is demanding that Habib speed up the actual capitulation the PLO. And while these talks are in progress, an ABC correspondent reports, by stopping the supply of water, food and medicines, Israel is actually seeking to annihilate through starvation and thirst the Palestinian partisans in west Beirut, and that means its inhabitants, too.

And so we have made a full circle, and neither the hypocritical pity of the White House for the fate of the peaceful population of the Lebanese capital, nor the peacemaking efforts of the self-appointed mediators can hide the complicity and even direct participation of the United States in the evil deeds of the Israeli military.

## Identity of Views

LD031940 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 3 Aug 82

[From "The World Today" program presented by political observer Eduard Mnatsakanov]

[Text] We shall now show you another video report we received today from the Lebanese capital. Everything indicates that the aggressor is preparing a tank breakthrough to the center of the city. Fresh Israeli reinforcements and heavy tanks have been brought to all the control points between east and west Beirut. During the night over 80 M-60 tanks of U.S. manufacture, Israeli Merkava tanks, armored carriers, and self-propelled artillery units have been moved there.

The massive bombardment of west Beirut has caused great devastation among the peaceful population of the Lebanese capital during the last few days. Eight percent of all the buildings in the city have been virtually destroyed and look like this. The greater part of the city is enveloped in flames and smoke.

The murder of completely innocent citizens has been going on far too long and it is time for President Reagan to do what he can, the Washington POST writes in an editorial article. Reagan says, according to the newspaper, that it is urgently necessary to stop the bloodshed, but he has done nothing so far. Such a position enables the Israeli Army to make use of firepower when it suits it, the American newspaper writes. But the U.S. is not only standing idle, it is actually in solidarity with everything that the aggressors do.

And precisely this is shown by the talks between Israeli Foreign Minister Shamir and Secretary of State Shultz and other American leaders. Speaking after these talks in Washington, Shamir spoke with satisfaction about the identity of views of Tel Aviv and Washington on the events in Lebanon and made it understood that the supply of modern American weapons to Israel will continue in the future.

## 'Common Aims'

LD031748 Moscow TASS in English 1636 GMT 3 Aug 82

[Text] Moscow August 3 TASS -- TASS news analyst Boris Shabayev writes:

The American ABC television company points out that there is a growing tendency world-wide to blame President Reagan for the course of actions by Israeli Premier Begin.

Meanwhile the American President is rejecting such charges. The President claims that his administration strives through the efforts made by Ambassador Habib and also through the United Nations Organization for a ceasefire that will put an end to the suffering in Lebanon. But the world community knows not from the statements by the U.S. President but from the facts how such a "striving" is implemented in practice, let us say, at the U.N. The facts are as follows: More than 30 times, including in the course of Israel's current barbaric aggression against Lebanon, the USA has vetoed the resolutions of the U.N. Security Council condemning the aggressive actions of its ally.

The USA has proved to be the only U.N. Security Council member to have refused to support the demand for the lifting of the Israeli siege of Beirut, which was received by the Tel Aviv ruling clique, with good reason, as a direct blessing for an assualt against the Lebanese capital.

Thus facts irrefutable testify that at the United Nations Organization the USA has been most shamelessly frustrating all attempts at putting the stop to Israel's aggressive actions. If such a stand can be described as a "striving for a peaceful settlement," then what is instigation to escalation of aggression?!

The attempts to picture as "peace-making" the efforts by the ill-famed "expert" in Middle East crises Philip Habib look really miserable. The Arab and world press wrote with good reason that every appearance of Habib in the region was marked by Tel Aviv's fresh bandit sorties. The French LE MONDE aptly describes the "present efforts" by the American embassy as a "masquerade" designed for a stage-by-stage extermination of the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples.

That's where the trouble lies. But its unexampled hyprocrisy and florid phraseology of peacebleness Washington is trying to cover its complicity in Lebanon's tragedy, its involvement in the Israeli aggression. But the world has not forgotten that this aggression, which is a direct outcome of the Camp David deal, has been planned and is being implemented within the framework of the American-Israeli agreement on "strategic cooperation." The details of the "Lebanese Cedar" operation, which is now being implemented by the 100 thousand strong Israeli force armed to the teeth by Washington, were coordinated during the visit to the USA of Israeli Defence Minister A. Sharon literally a few days before its start. Now that the American President has been so angered by accusations against the USA as an accomplice in the Israeli aggression, Tel Aviv's Foreign Minister Y. Shamir, who is currently on a visit in the American capital, is boasting for everybody to hear "close contacts" between the USA and Israel and declaring that they have "common aims" in Lebanon.

These common aims -- the establishment of an American-Zionist protectorate over the Middle East, determine the policy of official Washington, its real attitude to the events in Lebanon, and therefore so topical is the warning of Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev addressed by him to the American President: "The tragedy of Lebanon, and especially of the population of its capital, will be an indeliable stain on the conscience of those who could stop the aggressor, but have not done so."

## NICARAGUAN, CUBAN MINISTERS ARRIVE IN MOSCOW

LD031216 Moscow TASS in English 1153 GMT 3 Aug 82

[Text] Moscow August 3 TASS -- Foreign ministers of the Republic of Nicaragua, Miguel d'Escoto and of the Republic of Cuba, Isidoro Malmierca Peoli, arrived in the Soviet capital today. They are members of a delegation of the committee of foreign ministers of the non-aligned states on Lebanon.

ATTEMPTS TO RALLY SUPPORT FOR PALESTINIANS

Saudi, PDRY, YAR Leaders

LD031930 Moscow TASS in English 1815 GMT 3 Aug 82

[Text] Kuwait, August 3 TASS -- Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme People's Council and Prime Minister of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen 'Ali Nasir Muhammad, President 'Ali 'Abdallah Salih of the Yemen Arab Republic and Saudi Arabian King Fahd have declared in support of the struggle waged by the Arab people of Palestine for the restoration of their rights, including the right to the creation of an independent state. At a meeting in Jidda (Saudi Arabia) the leaders of the three states urged the Arab countries to unite in face of the Israeli aggression in Lebanon.

Castro Urges UN Action

PM030951 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jul 82 p 4

[TASS report: "Urgent Steps Must Be Taken: F. Castro's Message to the UN Security Council Chairman"]

[Text] Havana, 29 Jul -- Fidel Castro, chairman of the Nonaligned Movement, has sent a message to the UN Security Council chairman in connection with the Israeli aggression in Lebanon.

Israel's criminal aggression against the Palestinians and Lebanese beseiged in Beirut is being stepped up with every passing day, the document says. Nonetheless, they are unswervingly defending their rights and their motherland with exemplary heroism.

All people on earth, all governments and particularly the UN Security Council, whose main function is the preservation and maintenance of peace throughout the world, undoubtedly bear a responsibility for the events taking place in Lebanon. The situation demands that we exert the maximum effort to halt the genocide against the population of Beirut. The Security Council, the message says, must immediately take the necessary steps to end the siege and bombardment of Beirut and ensure the unconditional withdrawal of Israeli troops from Lebanese territory.

The U.S. administration's support for Israel's actions is an open secret and therefore it is extremely necessary to demonstrate the international community's angry denunciation of the misanthropic strategic alliance between the United States and Israel whose aim is to destroy the Palestinian people and the progressive Lebanese forces.

On behalf of the Nonaligned Movement F. Castro urged the United Nations and the UN Security Council to take the necessary steps immediately to halt Israeli aggression.

PFLP'S HABASH ON PALESTINIANS' 'STEADFASTNESS'

LD031942 Moscow in Arabic to the Arab World 1500 GMT 3 Aug 82

[Text] The steadfastness and bravery of the defenders of Beirut and their growing skill in organizing armed confrontation of the Zionist invaders has astonished the entire world. What is the cause of this phenomenon which the invaders and their defenders across the ocean failed to take into account when they planned the invasion of Lebanon? At the request of our special correspondent Farid Seyful-Mulyukov, Comrade George Habash, one of the leaders of the defense of Beirut and secretary general of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, answered this question:

[Begin Habash recording] In fact, I would not be exaggerating if I said that the steadfastness of our Palestinian and Lebanese masses in Lebanon resisting this invasion has indeed surpassed all expectations.

Perhaps you heard the estimates of the Zionist enemy when it thought that it would be able to achieve all the objectives of this campaign in 3 days. Now we see that about 55 days have passed without the Zionist enemy being able to achieve its objectives.

We are very proud of this steadfastness and there are in fact brilliant examples of it of which we shall be proud throughout history. For instance, imagine what happened at Ayn al-Hulwah, a small camp in the Tyre area which was surrounded -- and we know the Israeli military machine and its size and its destruction capability -- and was constantly threatened by all the types of bombs and shells, including those which are banned internationally. The camp stood fast -- 1 day, 2 days, 3, 4, 5 days -- for about 20 days. Just an ordinary camp stood fast in the face of this Israeli military machine for more than 20 days.

Let us take another example: the situation in Beirut now. Imagine: Beirut is encircled and the noose is being tightened. It is threatened with the cut-off of water and electricity and the threats are carried out. Raids were staged; if you were in Beirut in the last few days perhaps you saw the constant raids for 7 successive days, yet despite all this you feel the rising morale of our masses and of our fighters and our actual ability to stand fast.

There are many factors which played a role in this steadfastness -- the belief of the Palestinian fighter that the cause for which he struggles is just. This aggression demonstrated clearly that in the face of the enemy's ferocity there is a people who believes its cause is just. What has happened in Beirut in the past 2 months gives the most brilliant examples of the meaning of belief in a just cause and the ability to stand fast which this belief generates. This factor is in addition to the presence of the joint forces; by this I mean the presence of the Lebanese forces on our side, the forces of the nationalist progressive movement. Add to this the steadfastness of the Beirut masses and the presence of our ally, the Syrian regime, which has also been besieged by forces, just as we have in Beirut.

These factors are in addition to the feeling of our people, masses and fighters that they enjoy the support of the progressive public opinion in the world that is observing their victories. All this explains the brilliant steadfastness of our masses in Lebanon. [end recording]

MEETINGS PROTEST ISRAELI 'BRAZEN AGGRESSION'

LD311634 Moscow TASS in English 1448 GMT 31 Jul 82

[Text] Moscow July, 31 TASS -- The Soviet people voice angry protest against Israel's brazen aggression in Lebanon. At numerous meetings all over the USSR it is stressed that Tel Aviv has grossly flouted the norms of international law, the United Nations Charter.

We have at hand a piratic act to which the definition of aggression adopted by the 29th session of the United Nations General Assembly in 1974 fully applies, said director of the Institute of State and Law of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Vladimir Kudryavtsev. Genocide is Israel's international crime in Lebanese land, the scientist said. The methods and means used by the aggressor in Lebanon are also the gross violation of laws of warfare envisaged by international law, violation of The Hague conventions, of the Geneva Convention and other juridical acts.

Deeply concerned over the crisis situation in Lebanon, the Soviet people unanimously support Leonid Brezhnev's address to the President of the United States, the answers of the Soviet leader to the questions of the newspaper PRAVDA.

They point to the invaluable significance of these documents for a just Middle East settlement. It is stressed that withdrawal from Lebanon of preceisely Israeli interventionist forces is the indispensable condition of the settlement.

At the same time the confidence is expressed that Israel's intervention will be a failure, that the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples will win. The aggressor will have to answer for its crimes. This was said at meetings in Moscow, the Armenian capital Yerevan, the Moldavian capital Kishinev, Azerbaijan's capital Baku, Kazakhstan's capital Alma Ata and other cities of the USSR. The greater the brutality of the Zionist barbarians, the stronger the indignation of the Soviet people.

Further Report

GF040924 Tashkent International Service in Uzbek 1700 GMT 3 Aug 82

[Text] Tashkent radio correspondents in the Soviet socialist republics in Central Asia have been reporting on protest meetings against Israel's aggression against Lebanon. Protest meetings have been held in Tashkent, Alma Ata, Frunze, Dushanbe, Samarkand, Urgench and other cities.

The thousands of people participating in the meeting strongly condemn the (?crimes) the Israeli militarists have been commiting in Lebanon under the protection of the United States.

They also expressed strong support for Leonid Brezhnev's letter to the U.S. President and for the statement issued by TASS. Leonid Brezhnev's letter and the statement issued by the agency voice the Soviet people's view regarding the necessity of taking practical measures aimed at ending the aggression.

EGYPTIAN MINISTER CITED ON REGIONAL ISSUES

LD032030 Moscow in Arabic to the Arab World 1530 GMT 3 Aug 82

[Text] Egyptian Defense Minister Gen Abu Ghazalah made a detailed statement to [the Egyptian newspaper] MAY giving his views on some aspects of the events in the Middle East. The defense minister admitted that the situation in the region continues to deteriorate and threatens innumerable disasters for the entire Arab nation. In attempting to identify those responsible for the current events, he made a few criticisms of the United States and, surprisingly, the Soviet Union.

General Abu Ghazalah raised many questions without even attempting to answer them despite the fact that answering them would have been a very simple matter. Israel's aggression against Lebanon, which is supported by the United States, is a direct result of the U.S.-Israeli-Egyptian Camp David deal. Tel Aviv has made no secret of the fact that its deal with Egypt enabled it to withdraw forces from the Egyptian-Israeli border -- its border with the strongest Arab country -- and sent them to other areas, particularly for use against Syria and Lebanon.

Was it not after Camp David that Israel officially announced the annexation of the Syrian Golan Heights? Tel Aviv never mentioned this before Camp David. Would it have dared to invade Lebanon if its rear was not guaranteed by Egypt? Abu Ghazalah is a military man and knows well that the Israeli Army has limited human resources and would have avoided embarking on a war on many fronts.

Thus, the main thing that enabled Israel to invade Lebanon was the United States' military and political support and Egypt's neutral stand -- or, in simpler terms, the Camp David trap, into which As-Sadat pushed the Egyptian people.

SOVIET-ALGERIAN ECONOMIC TALKS BEGIN IN MOSCOW

LD031904 Moscow in Arabic to the Arab World 1500 GMT 3 Aug 82

[Text] Soviet-Algerian economic talks on the scope of cooperation in agriculture began in Moscow today. New agricultural projects, including the construction of irrigation dams, are being discussed. The USSR also helps the development of agriculture in Syria, the PDRY and some other Arab countries.

MOSCOW TELEVISION ON ATTEMPTED COUP IN KENYA

LD031604 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 2 Aug 82

[From the "World Today" program, presented by political observer Vladimir Dunayev]

[Text] Dramatic events have occurred in Kenya. Some details on yesterday's attempted coup in that country were made public today. Nairobi radio carried a communique from the Kenyan capital informing the country about the change of power in Kenya and the deposition of the president and government, who have been accused of being corrupt, of being undemocratic and so on.

This communique was prepared by a group of Air Force officers from a nearby base after they had captured the radio station. Following an exchange of fire near the radio station, the police and the army managed to beat the officers back. Martial music was then played. and an announcement was made that the rebellion had been crushed and that the Army remained loyal to the president.

President Daniel arap Moi spoke on the radio that evening. He has occupied this post for 4 years--since the death of Jomo Kenyatta, founder of independent Kenya, under whom Moi was vice president. President Daniel arap Moi announced that he had to urgently end his tour of the country and return to Nairobi to direct the crushing of the rebellion at the Air Force bases. He said that a Kenyan military aircraft had landed at Dar es Salaam, capital of neighboring Tanzania, that night with four military officers on board. It is thought that they are four leaders of the failed coup.

TANZANIAN AGENCY ON U.S. 'ANTI-AFRICAN OPERATION'

LD031604 Moscow TASS in English 1322 GMT 3 Aug 82

[Text] Dar es Salaam August 3 TASS -- The main role in attempts at frustrating a summit meeting of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) in Tripoli belongs to the USA. If the chain of events preceding the session is analyzed, the agency's [SHIHATA] commentary points out, it will become perfectly clear that the present situation is not so much the consequence of differences inside the OAU as the result of official Washington's systematic actions.

In this connection the news agency recalls the expulsion of Libyan diplomats from the USA in May 1981, the attack on Libyan planes by U.S. fighter planes near the shores of Libya in August last year, the CIA-elaborated plan for the assassination of Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi, the leader of the Libyan revolution. In attempts to split African unity the USA puts massive pressure to bear first of all on Morocco, the SHIHATA news agency points out.

Within the framework of Washington's anti-African operation, Morocco was visited within a short period of time by Caspar Weinberger, U.S. secretary of defence, Alexander Haig, when he was U.S. secretary of state, Admiral Bobby R. Inman, former deputy director of the CIA, Charles Percy, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and by other high-ranking emissaries of the Reagan administration. U.S. Ambassador at Large Vernon Walters visited Rabat several times. One of the purposes of the tour of African countries by Jeane Kirkpatrick, permanent representative of the USA at the United Nations, in June was to prevent Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi from being elected the OAU chairman.

The SHIHATA news agency also recalls that the USA secured the signing of an agreement with Morocco under which the "Rapid Deployment Forces" got access to military facilities on Moroccan soil.

BISHOP COMMENTS ON USSR-GRENADA AGREEMENTS

LD041040 Moscow TASS in English 1010 GMT 4 Aug 82

[Text] Havana August 4 TASS -- The treaties signed during the official friendly visit to the Soviet Union by a party and government delegation of Grenada are strategically important for the further development of the revolutionary process in Grenada and will help lessen its dependence on the capitalist world. This was said in Saint Georges by the prime minister of Grenada, Maurice Bishop, who returned home on Wednesday from a visit to the Soviet Union.

SANDINIST LEADERS THANK BREZHNEV, TIKHONOV

PM031317 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Jul 82 p 1

[Text] To Comrade Leonid Ilich Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium

To Comrade Nikolay Aleksandrovich Tikhonov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers

Esteemed Comrades:

On behalf of the Sandinist National Liberation Front [FSLN] National Directorate, the Junta [rukovodyashchiy sovet] of the Government of National Reconstruction, the members of the FSLN and all our people, we thank you for your fraternal congratulations and solidarity on the third anniversary of the revolution.

Three years after the day of victory, the Sandinist People's Revolution is continuing its victorious march. Sandino's people, under the leadership of the FSLN, are moving forward, each day defending their revolutionary gains.

Despite imperialism's intrigues and its systematic provocations and aggression, we are continuing our creative activity and the quest for new paths helping to strengthen world peace.

We thank the CPSU, the government and the Soviet people for their support in the full confidence that our relations of friendship and cooperation will continue to strengthen in the future.

[Signed] Daniel Ortega Saavedra, member of the FSLN National Directorate and coordinator of the Junta of the Government of National Reconstruction

Bayardo Arce Castano, member of the FSLN National Directorate and coordinator of the FSLN National Directorate Political Commission

RPP CHARGES OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS ON SHEFFIELD

PY031808 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Spanish to Latin America 0130 GMT 1 Aug 82

[Excerpts] Two rescue ships leased by the British Navy have arrived in the Malvinas area. These ships have joined the rescue operations under way at the point where the destroyer Sheffield went down. These rescue operations are taking place under utmost secrecy. One can easily assume that the objective of the operation is to recover the nuclear weapons on board the ship. This is what our military observer Maj Vyacheslav Vladimirov has to say on the subject:

After all, was the British task force carrying nuclear weapons or not? At this point, the answer to this question has more than historical significance. It is vital to millions of persons, and not only to those in Latin America.

I would like to recall the words of British Defense Minister John Nott when the task force was sailing toward the Malvinas. At that point he said it had sailed carrying its full firepower.

Meanwhile, it is well known that all key NATO warships carry nuclear weapons on their voyages through the seas of the world. The task force that sailed to the Malvinas was assembled hastily and far from nuclear maintenance bases where this type of weapon could be off-loaded.

It could well be that the Sheffield, one of the most modern British ships, did not carry nuclear arms; but experts unanimously reject this possibility. Furthermore, these experts indicate that the [registration] numbers of the Sea Lynx helicopters that were deployed in battle, and which were equipped for launching nuclear antisubmarine rockets, tally with the [registration] of the ships of the task force, especially the 42 and 41 [as heard] types. To these types belong not only the Sheffield but the sunken Coventry, Antelope and Ardent. Thus, all these ships could and probably did carry nuclear weapons.

There is yet another reason to believe there were nuclear weapons on board the Sheffield. As is well known, this ship was damaged by rocket fire from the Argentine Air Force but remained afloat. In view of this, it was decided to tow it away from the area of military activities. However, in the course of the towing operation, the British themselves scuttled the ship.

The British High Command could hardly be prepared to lose so easily a brand new ship that cost a great deal of money and which could still be repaired. The main reason why the ship was scuttled was, no doubt, that there were nuclear weapons on board. The possibility of a fire on board the damaged ship, the damage to the nuclear cargo itself, or the fear of another Argentine attack on the now defenseless ship had not only turned the ship into a potential source of danger by also had increased the risk of exposure.

The observers wonder whether nuclear weapons would have been used in the course of the Malvinas conflict. I would say yes. I would say yes, because the occupation of the Malvinas was planned as an experiment and as an example that provided for the use of nuclear weapons to instill fear not only in Argentina, but in other Latin American nations as well.

The Malvinas conflict revealed new aspects of the neocolonial and imperialistic policy of the United States, and it revealed another side of the Yankee-NATO strategy of limited nuclear warfare. The word "limited" should read "unilateral," meaning war waged by a nuclear power against a nonnuclear nation. Within the framework of this strategy, the Malvinas conflict played the role of an introduction to the new stage of imperialist wars against peoples struggling for their independence and sovereignty. At this stage, it is possible to use those nuclear weapons.

U.S. 'MILITARY PREPARATIONS' IN CARIBBEAN SCORED

LD031230 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0351 GMT 3 Aug 82

["An Invasion Is Being Prepared" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow 3 Aug (TASS) -- The United States is whipping up the situation in the zone of the Caribbean Basin, KRASNAYA ZVEZDA writes today. A campaign of threats against Cuba, Nicaragua, and Grenada, and of lies about the patriotic forces of El Salvador and Guatemala is being spread.

U.S. military preparations in the Caribbean Basin zone are being stepped up. The headquarters of the Caribbean operational unit in Key West (Florida), which has been created specially for gendarme functions in that region, has been transformed into yet another new U.S. regional command, intended for leading military interference in the affairs of the peoples of Latin American countries. U.S. military bases are being expanded and modernized in the zone of the Panama Canal, in Guantanamo, Puerto Rico and on Viegues Island. The paper continues: A new naval base is being built on the island of San Andres, situated in the center of the Caribbean Sea.

Intensive preparation of counterrevolutionary forces is taking place in the countries of that region. Remnants of the Somoza killers and mercenaries drawn from the number of Cuban emigrants are being transferred to the so-called 'front lines' with Nicaragua, after going through a training course following American 'programs' in camps in Florida, southern California and Honduras.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA stresses: Not wishing to take account of the real state of affairs, Washington is attempting to obstruct the path to positive social change in the countries of Central America and the Caribbean Basin at any price, including unleashing a war.

The provocative actions by the United States are evoking angry protests in Latin America and throughout the world. People condemn Washington's new military adventure, the sabre rattling against Cuba, Nicaragua and the other Latin American states conducting an independent foreign policy. And in this they find warm support from the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community, which are steadfastly coming out on the side of those who are defending the just cause of social progress and the protection of their security, the paper notes in conclusion.

RPP SCORES U.S. INTERVENTION IN CENTRAL AMERICA

PY040116 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Spanish to Latin America 0130 GMT 1 Aug 82

[Text] The U.S. Navy fleet is carrying out exercises in Jamaican territorial waters with the participation of Jamaican patrol boats. The U.S. nuclear-powered submarine Tinosa and the destroyer Preble are participating in these exercises. They were seen moored in the port of Kingston, where Yankee warships usually dock.

This year the number of these warships already totals 40. The U.S. restlessness in the Jamaican waters squares with Washington's general policy to augment its strength in the Antilles and in Central America.

This year, for example, the United States carried out a number of exercises; the greatest of which was Ocean Venture '82. Almost 50,000 military personnel, 350 planes, 60 warships, including an aircraft carrier, participated. As a general rule, attacks on island countries like Cuba and Grenada are simulated in these exercise. Maritime blockades and massive air and artillery bombing are orchestrated. Very often a show of force is displayed far from the actual location of the exercises. For example, during the popular insurrection against Somoza, a U.S. Navy fleet covered the Nicaraguan coasts. Today the United States is continuously in view off the Salvadoran coasts, especially in the Gulf of Fonseca, where it is building a military base on Amapala Island with the help of the Honduran Army.

All this confirms an old truth. During the past 4 decades, Central America and the Antilles have been one of the main targets of the aggressive policy of the United States. The international community will not forget the overthrow of the popular government of Jacobo Arbenz Guzman in Guatemala, in 1954; the aborted invasion attempt of Cuba at the Bay of Pigs in 1961; the landing of U.S. Marines in the Dominican Republic in 1965; political and economic destabilization attempts in Panama, Costa Rica, Jamaica and other countries in 1978 and [words indistinct]. All these acts of aggression have been included in the plans for an economic community, Alliance for Progress, etc. But during the latest period, the [words indistinct] were only the continuation of the big stick policy, the common denominator of all past relations between the United States and Latin American states.

Since the beginning of its existence, the United States has undertaken 14 armed actions against Mexico; 13 against Cuba; 11 against Panama; 10 against Nicaragua; 9 against the Dominican Republic; 7 against Colombia; 7 against Honduras; 5 against Haiti; 3 against Puerto Rico; and 2 against Guatemala.

The U.S. warmongering circles are currently operating in compliance with the new inter-American policy program for the 1980's, according to the Santa Fe Document, outlined by Reagan's advisers long before he assumed power. This document provides for an unequivocal policy: war rather than peace is the general rule in international affairs. To outline its policy of international relations with Central American and the Antillean countries, Reagan made the following comparisons: El Salvador is closer to Texas than Texas is to Massachusetts, a fact which [words indistinct] the security of our neighbors is in keeping with our dearest vital interests.

Nevertheless, the Central American and Caribbean countries do not voice their protests because they consider themselves the strategic southern borders of the United States. They understand better than anyone else that this is presumably the policy of Yankee imperialism, which is aimed at restricting their sovereignty and independence to justify the armed intervention by this colossus from the north.

The escalation of armed intervention and provocations in Central America executed by Washington has led the Nicaraguan Government to petition the United Nations to hold an emergency session of the Security Council. The constant tension in Central America and the increasing danger of military intervention by the United States on a large scale in themselves pose a great threat to the independence and sovereignty of Central American states, and to international peace and security as well, the Nicaraguan note states.

This policy confirms that the Reagan administration completely ignores the changes taking place in the world, and that it is trying to restore gunboat diplomacy in Latin America.

## AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENTS FOR 3 AUG REPORTED

LD040230 [Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian on 3 Aug. Times of broadcasts are given in parentheses at the end of each item.

Agriculture workers in Nikolpolskiy Rayon, Dnepropetrovskaya Oblast, are the first to have fulfilled the sale of grain to the state, giving 65,000 tons of grain. The rayon is also the first to have completed the harvest of all early grain crops, while in other rayons the final stage has been started. Udmurtskaya ASSR Non-Chernozem Zone farmers have started sowing winter crops. To date, seeds have been sown on the first tens of thousands of hectares. Winter crops at the present time in the autonomous republic will take up 390,000 hectares. (0204 GMT)

Farms of all oblasts of Belorussia are carrying out harvest work. The first 250,000 hectares of grain and cereal crops have been cut. Grain reception and grain processing enterprises have started work on the new harvest grain. Northeast rayon farms of Bashkirskaya ASSR have started mass harvest work. Khabarovskiy Kray has fulfilled the plan for the procurement of hay; 250,000 tons have been delivered to farms. Weather is good and wrok continues on fodder reserves. Omskaya Oblast grain purveyors are completing preparations for the harvest. (0400 GMT)

Machine operators of Orenburgskaya Oblast have started cutting grain crops on the second millionth hectare and daily grain crops are harvested from an area of over 100,000 hectares. Harvesting oats and barley has started in Altayskiy Kray. In eastern and mountainous zones, the rye harvest is in full swing. (0600 GMT)

Dzhezhkazganskaya Oblast in Kazakhstan has begun harvesting grain. Ten oblasts are now involved in the grain harvest. Last week, barley and wheat was reaped and threshed from 700,000 hectares. Grain crops and cereal crops were reared on an area of 2.3 million hectares in the republic. (0900 GMT)

The elevators of Stavropolskiy steppe land have received 100,000 tons of grain from Blagodarnenskiy Rayon. Having been among the first in the kray to fulfill the year's plan for the sale of grain to the state, the rayon today completely finished the threshing of cereals on an area of more than 90,000 hectares. Mass harvesting of grain crops has begun in Mariyskaya ASSR. Grains and pulses are to be gathered in from 330,000 hectares. (1000 GMT)

In a report on the country's grain crops harvest, Aleskandr Ruvinskiy notes that grain has been cut on over 1/4 of the sown area. The second secretary of the Yeyskiy Raykom in Krasnodarskiy Kray reports that the harvesting of grain crops, cereal crops and pulse crops in the rayon has been completed. Harvesting conditions were difficult but farmers rose to the challenge. So far, 60,000 tons of valuable and strong wheat have been sold to the state. Work is going on to produce super-strong wheat containing over 32 percent gluten. The sunflower harvest will begin soon; the crop covers an area of 16,500 hectares and farmers have pledged to sell about 30,000 tons to the state. The time for harvesting corn for grain, vegetables and fruit is also approaching. A report from Ulyanovskaya Oblast says that grain crops have been harvested on 250,000 hectares -- about 1/4 of the oblast's grain area. All work is going according to plan. (1100 GMT)

Farms in the Stavropolskiy steppes have completed threshing on 500,000 hectares of grain crops. In Mariyskaya ASSR 100,000 tons of hay have been procured to date, an all-time record in the republic. (1300 GMT)

## AGRICULTURAL OFFICIAL ON HARVEST PROGRESS

LD032140 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 3 Aug 82

[Text] Kolkhozes and sovkhozes in Krasnodarskiy Kray are carrying out grain deliveries in an organized fashion. Grain from the third million hectares is beginning to come into elevators.

We have asked Boris Petrovich Parshin, deputy head of the Main Grain Crops Administration of the USSR Ministry of Agriculture, to comment on the first results of harvesting.

[Begin Parshin recording] Grain harvesting is proceeding in the Kuban under difficult weather conditions. Frequent rain and strong winds have caused lodging on considerable areas and have made the cutting and threshing of grain difficult. And now, when cereal harvesting is being completed on the last hectares in the main steppe regions, it can be said that mechanizers in Krasnodarskiy Kray have honorably coped with these trials and again gladdened the homeland with a good crop.

Of course, these results have been obtained by the efforts of many labor collectives, all those which took a direct part in the cutting and threshing of grain and the rapid transportation of the new grain crop to the threshing floors. Day and night, 17,000 grain harvesting combines worked on the fields of the kray, together with 1,208 harvesting-transportation complexes and detachments. All harvesting machines were regulated in good time and provided with the necessary attachments. Group utilization of equipment was ensured everywhere as well as the relief shift method of mechanizers' work. Taking into account the state of the plantings, either two-stage harvesting or direct combining was carried out.

A special feature of the harvesting campaign in the Kuban is the struggle for the quality of operations, for a full harvest of the grain grown together with all the chaff and straw and for their rapid transportation from the fields so that the soil can be ploughed up without delay for bastard fallow. Even on the fields where the optimum doses of organic fertilizer were applied, tillage time has not exceeded 2 to 3 days. Kolkhozes and sovkhozes of the kray are now selling grain to the state in organized fashion.

As in previous years, many farms in Yeyskiy, (Sherbinovskiy), Leningradskiy, Timashevskiy and other rayons are delivering mainly strong and valuable wheats to grain reception centers. It is now up to the rail workers: They should speed up transportation of grain because the (?kanevskaya) and some other Kuban elevators are now full. [end recording]

IZVESTIYA: FERTILIZER PRODUCTION DELAYED

PM021510 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Jul 82 Morning Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Construction Sites of the Fertilizer Industry"]

[Text] The 26th CPSU Congress decisions outlined an extensive system of measures to further develop agriculture in the land of the soviets. Their implementation is directly linked with intensifying the sector, placing it on an industrial footing and improving production efficiency. It is natural that the chemicalization of agriculture assumes tremendous significance here, for the rational utilization of fertilizers and chemical protection agents is the right way to improve soil fertility and crop yields and to increase production of foodstuffs for the population and raw materials for inudstry. During the last 5-year plan, for example, farms received a considerable quantity of mineral fertilizers, and today farmers obtain approximately 1/2 the harvest thanks to the use of mineral fertilizers, herbicides and other chemicals.

The Food Program approved by the CPSU Central Committee May (1982) plenum allocates an important place to the further chemicalization of agriculture. By 1990, supplies of fertility vitamins will reach 30-32 million tons (in 100-percent nutrient equivalent), which is more than 4 times the 1965 level. Huge resources are being allocated to developing the mineral fertilizer industry. In the 11th 5-Year Plan it is planned to commission more than 150 new complexes for the production of 8 million tons of mineral fertilizers, 6.1 million tons of ammonia, 4.2 million tons of sulfuric acid and 2 million tons of sulfur. The more quickly the new production facilities start producing, the sooner the funds invested will be recouped through an increase in the harvest.

Construction workers' collectives and workers of the Ministry for the Production of Mineral Fertilizers have launched a competition for the successful implementation of the 11th 5-Year Plan. Dozens of shops, units and production facilities have been commissioned and are already producing. The Voronezh construction workers of the USSR Construction Ministry's Pridonkhimstroy trust have set a good example by the early commissioning of capacities for the production of 450,000 tons of ammonia. On the basis of socialist competition, the collectives of the Karsnodarkhimstroy trusts of the USSR Ministry of Industrial Construction, the installation organizations of the USSR Ministry of Installation and Special Construction Work and the Krasnodar chemical plant have decided to accelerate the construction and ensure the ahead-of-schedule commissioning of a Nitroammophoska production facility with a capacity of 270,000 tons.

At the same time a serious lag has occurred on a number of projects. The commissioning of capacities for the production of ammonia in Tolyatti and Fergana and mineral fertilizers in Kemerovo, Novgorod, Cherepovets and Berezniki and at certain other enterprises was not ensured last year. It is also a disturbing fact that the plan of construction in the first half of 1982 was underfulfilled.

Analysis attests that a considerable lag has occurred on many projects nearing completion and projects under way in the fulfillment of construction and installation work, including on such important construction projects as those for the production of liquid compound fertilizers in Yefremov, potash fertilizers at the Novosolikamskiy potassium plant and potassium nitrate at the Berezniki Azot production association. Things are going badly with the construction workers building the Dorogobuzh nitrogen fertilizer plant: It has to be said that in situations of this sort the client -- the Ministry for the Production of Mineral Fertilizers -- is frequently to blame as well. Thus, it did not ensure the timely delivery of equipment for the production of phosphorus at the Novo-Dzhambulskiy plant and ammonia in Fergana and Tolyatti. Naturally this did not have the best effect on construction progress.

The conference held recently at the CPSU Central Committee of secretaries of union republic communist party central committees, kraykoms and obkoms and leaders of a number of ministries, department, industrial enterprises and construction projects examined questions of accelerating the construction and commissioning of enterprises in industries producing mineral fertilizers, chemical plant protection agents, microbiological products and raw materials for them. Substantial shortcomings in this work were noted at the conference. The leaders of a number of ministries and departments were seriously criticized for not devoting proper attention to construction projects for the fertility industry and not creating conditions for the rapid commissioning and startup of new projects. The construction conveyer belt is held up and sometimes even stopped because of bad organization, formalism in socialist competition, unsatisfactory material and technical supplies and blunders and mistakes in planning estimates. An end must be put to this as soon as possible.

The USSR Ministries of Construction, Industrial Construction, Construction of Heavy Industry Enterprises, Installation and Special Construction Work and Mineral Fertilizer Production must ensure the radical improvement of matters in capital construction and take measures without delay to overcome the lag that has occurred and to ensure the unconditional fulfillment of the plan for 1982 and the subsequent years of the 5-year plan for commissioning production capacities. Monitoring progress in the construction of fertility industry projects must become the daily concern of local soviets. It is necessary to galvanize the activities of deputies' posts on every construction site. Soviet, economic and trade organizations must create all conditions for the on-scheule commissioning of projects, consistently and efficiently regulate cooperation among subcontractors, establish everyone's degree of responsibility for the end results and call strictly to account those persons guilty of violating planning discipline.

Chief attention should now be focused on concentrating means and resources on projects nearing completion, and the harmonious working of the entire construction process must be organized.

The correct action is being taken where people use the proven form of labor cooperation according to the "work relay" principle under the slogan "Let us build ahead of schedule and start up ahead of schedule!" And where they persistently introduce team contracting and adopt the Sverdlovsk workers' initiative "Five-year target with smaller numbers." To make efficient use of the progressive experience accumulated in constructing fertility industry projects means making a substantial contribution to realizing the Food Program and satisfying the Soviet people's vital requirements.

RSFSR CSA REPORTS GRAIN HARVEST PROGRESS

LD033132 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 3 Aug 82

[Text] Grain harvesting is in progress on the greater part of RSFSR territory. Kholkhozes and sovkhozes of Moskovskaya, Yaroslavskaya and Ivanovskaya Oblasts have recently joined in harvesting. The RSFSR Central Statistical Administration reports that by the beginning of the week grain had been cut on 16.5 million hectares -- about 1/4 of the crops. More than 10 million hectares of the grain have been threshed.

In the Central-Chernozem Zone cutting has been carried out on 1/2 of the fields. Roughly the same amount of work has been completed in Orenburgskaya Oblast. In West Siberia grain harvesting has been started by farms of all oblasts and in east Siberia it has been started in the south of Krasnoyarskiy Kray.

Kolkhozes and sovkhozes are now preparing the soil for the coming winter's crop sowing. The optimum dates for this are now approaching in the Non-Chernozem Zone. A third of the fields have been plowed so far.

Statistics Analyzed

LD032158 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1530 GMT 3 Aug 82

[Excerpts] The RSFR Central Statistical Administration reported today on the progress of field work on kolkhozes and sovkhozes.

Commenting on the statistics at our request, (Nikolay Aleksandrovich Myatko), deputy head of the Main Agriculture Department of the RSFSR Ministry of Agriculture, noted that over the last few days the harvest has begun in practically all the central oblasts of the Non-Chernozem Zone of the republic. Mass reaping has started on farms of the Volga-Vyatka region and further to the south in the Central-Chernozem Zone. Along the Volga a considerable volume of the harvest work has been carried out.

The final stage of grain threshing (?throughout) the Caucasus has been reached. The harvest has now been gathered in on 5 million hectares. Many farms in Krasnodarskiy and Stavropolskiy Krays and Rostovskaya Oblast have fulfilled their planned grain sales to the state. In spite of the difficult weather conditions (?accompanying) the harvest, considerable quantities of (?strong, high-yield) wheat are reaching the elevators.

Figures on the preparation of the soil for sowing have also been analyzed statistically. In the Non-Chernozem Zone and Volga-Vyatka region, the best time for sowing winter crops is already beginning. However, as in a number of other regions in the Russian Federation, Comrade (Myatko) stressed, the soil is being prepared for sowing slowly. Throughout the entire republic, plowing has been completed on approximately 1/3 of the winter crop area to be plowed.

## COSMOS-1398 EARTH SATELLITE LAUNCHED 3 AUG

LD040650 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0610 GMT 4 Aug 82

[Text] Moscow, 4 Aug (TASS) -- On 3 August 1982 the USSR launched the latest artificial earth satellite Cosmos-1398. On board the satellite is scientific apparatus intended for continuation of space research.

The satellite has been put into orbit with the following parameters: initial period of revolution -- 89 minutes; maximum distance from the earth's surface (apogee) -- 262 kilometers minimum distance from the earth's surface (perigee) -- 225 kilometers; inclination of orbit -- 82.3 degrees.

In addition to scientific apparatus, the satellite has a radio system for the accurate measurement of elements of orbit's and a radiotelemetric system for transmitting to earth data about the work of instruments and scientific apparatus. The apparatus installed in the satellite is working normally.

The coordinating computer center is conducting processing of incoming information.

Moscow TASS in English at 0716 GMT on 4 August carries an identical report of the Cosmos-1398 launch.

## LATE REPORT: COSMOS-1399 SATELLITE LAUNCHED

LD041454 Moscow TASS in English 1445 GMT 4 Aug 82

[Text] Moscow August 4 TASS -- The Soviet Union today launched another artificial earth satellite, Cosmos-1399, to continue the exploration of outer space.

The initial period of revolution is 89.7 minutes, the maximum distance from the surface of the earth is 371 kilometers, the minimum -- 179 kilometers. The inclination of the orbit is 64.9 degrees.

Equipment aboard the satellite is functioning normally.

## BRIEFS

UZBEK MEDICAL CENTER -- A new medical center has been opened in [name indistinct], which has come to be known as the city of miners in the Uzbek SSR. This new medical center, which is one of the new hospitals being built in the Uzbek SSR, consists of two treatment sections and subsidiary buildings. The treatment sections have been supplied with the most up-to-date medical equipment. The new center, which is affiliated with the mining complex, is capable of extending medical services to over 260 patients per day. [Text] [Tashkent International Service in Uzbek 1700 GMT 18 Jul 82 GF]

TASHKENT SCIENTIFIC MEETING -- Uzbek Scientists in the medical field have held a meeting with representative from CEMA members in Tashkent. Among other things, the scientific meeting discussed the program for closer scientific cooperation in the future. [Tashkent International Service in Uzbek 1700 GMT 21 Jul 82 GF]

## ADMIRAL MEDVEDEV WRITES IN IZVESTIYA ON NAVY DAY

PM020841 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Jul 82 Morning Edition pp 1-2

[Article by Adm P. Medvedev, member of the Military Council and chief of the Political Directorate of the Navy, under the rubric "25 July -- USSR Navy Day": "The Fatherland's Ocean Shield"]

[Excerpts] On the last Sunday in July formidable warships stand in parade formation in the roadsteads of maritime cities. The Soviet people are celebrating a patriotic festival -- USSR Navy Day.

This year naval seamen are marking their festival in an atmosphere of high political and labor activeness among Army and Navy servicemen and all Soviet people. Persistently implementing the historic 26th party congress decisions, they are preparing a fitting report for the 60th anniversary of the USSR's formation. A new upsurge of strength and creative energy was aroused in our servicemen by the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee's May (1982) plenum and the report delivered at the plenum by Comrade L.I. Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, which are permeated with concern for increasing the people's well-being and for the might and prosperity of the socialist fatherland.

The CPSU and the Soviet Government devote constant attention to further strengthening the country's moral, political, economic and defense potential. V.I. Lenin's warning has a particularly topical ring today: "We have taught a whole series of mighty powers not to wage war on us, but we cannot count on this lasting for a long time. We must be prepared for the imperialist predators to turn on us again at the least change in the situation."

The aggressive forces of imperialism, above all American imperialism, which V.I. Lenin described in his day as "frenzied" and "bloody," are striving, under cover of the myth of the "Soviet military threat," to change the established military-strategic equilibrium of forces in their own favor and achieve superiority over the USSR and its allies. The United States and the NATO bloc have launched an arms race on an unprecedented scale. The United States openly declares the permissibility of unleashing either a limited or a global nuclear war and declares whole regions of the world to be in the sphere of its "vital interests."

In implementing its aggressive designs and hegemonist aspirations American imperialism makes active use of naval forces, making no secret of the anti-Soviet thrust of the "new U.S. naval strategy."

The USSR has always opposed the militarization of the ocean. In his speech at the 17th Trade Union Congress, Comrade L.I. Brezhnev expressed the Soviet side's readiness to reach agreement on mutual limitation of the actions of naval fleets, and in particular to agree that missile-carrying submarines should be withdrawn from their present extensive combat patrol regions and their voyages confined to within mutually agreed limits.

"We would also be prepared," Comrade L.I. Brezhnev stated, "to discuss the question of extending confidence-building measures to sea and ocean areas, particularly the regions where the busiest sea routes lie. In a word, we are in favor of making the largest possible part of the world ocean a zone of peace in the near future."

Concern for peace is the dominant concern in the policy of the Soviet Union and the socialist community countries. This is eloquently indicated by the Peace Program which is consistently implemented by the Communist Party and the Soviet Government and by all the peace initiatives put forward by the USSR and its Warsaw Pact allies. Our country has taken a new, exceptionally important, historic step in this direction -- the Soviet Union has unilaterally pledged not to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

Naval personnel, warmly and unanimously supporting the peace-loving policy of the Communist Party and the Soviet state, display high vigilance and, so to speak, keep their powder dry. In conjunction with the other branches of the Armed Forces they are an important factor in restraining and thwarting imperialism's aggressive aspirations. We have all we need for the reliable defense of the motherland from the sea. The fleet is armed with first-rate nuclear submarines and modern surface ships, naval missile-carrying and antisubmarine aircraft, highly effective weapons and sophisticated radio, electronics and automation systems.

But the fleet's main strength is its people, who are selflessly devoted to the ideals of communism and educated in the spirit of Soviet patriotism and socialist internationalism.

The combat collaboration between the Soviet Navy and the armies and navies of the fraternal socialist states is strengthening and developing. During their calls at foreign ports naval seamen worthily represent abroad the world's first socialist country, our heroic people and the Soviet way of life.

A mighty source of strength for the Army and Navy lies in their inseparable, intimate unity with the people. Naval collectives maintain constant close ties with local party, soviet, trade union and Komsomol organizations. I would like to express cordial gratitude to DOSAAF organizations for preparing good specialists for the Navy.

The creation of a mighty, modern ocean fleet is an outstanding labor feat. The servicemen of our glorious Navy respond to the concern of the Leninist Party and the Soviet people for the Armed Forces with constant readiness for armed defense of the motherland and the gains of socialism.